DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 159 977 HE 010 434

TITLE	Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Unionization and Collective Bargaining of the American Philosophical Association.
INSTITUTION	American Philosophical Association, Newark, Del.
PUB DATE	May 76
NOTE	145p.
AVAILABLE FROM	American Philosophical Association, University of Deleware, Newark, Delaware 19711 ($2.00)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$7.35 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Bibliographies; *Collective Bargaining; *College Faculty; *Employment Practices; Faculty Organizations; Governance; Higher Education; Negotiation Agreements; *Professional Associations; Questionnaires; Salary Differentials; Teacher Welfare; Teaching Benefits; *Teaching Conditions; *Unions
IDENTIFIERS	*American Philosophical Association

ABSTRACT

The background and activities of the Ad Hoc Committee on Unionization and Collective Bargaining of the American Philosophical Association are described, and the results of various investigations conducted by the Committee are summarized. Topics include the choice of an agent, or no agent, in unionizing; student role in governance; teaching and research conditions and the effects of unionization; governance structures; appointments, promotion, and tenure; and salary and benefits. Responses to a questionnaire (which is appended) sent to association members are summarized, and 21 suggestions are offered for making unionization more effective. The American Philosophical Association appears to be the first learned society to create a committee to study the implications of collective bargaining and to develop information and recommendations for its membership. Appendices include reports of the research teams on 10 higher educational institutions (California State College, Centralia College, Central Michigan University, Herbert Lehman College, Illinois Valley Community College, Macomb County Community College, Rutgers University, St. John's University, Temple University, and the University of Hawaii), comparative salary data on some target institutions, analysis of responses to the questionnaire, excerpts from reports by other organizations, and a short bibliography of publications about faculty unionization. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED159977

REPORT

of the

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIONIZATION AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

of the

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION

May 1976

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY American Philosophical Association TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC) AND USERS OF THE ERIC SYSTEM."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

HE010434

REPORT

of the

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIONIZATION AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

of the

AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION*

May 1976

Copyright © 1976 by The American Philosophical Association

*The work of the Ad Hoc Committee was facilitated by a financial grant from the American Council of Learned Societies. The ACLS assumes no responsibility for the content of this report.

CONTENTS

		Page
Foreword		1
Roster of the Ad Hoc Committee		2
I.	Origins, Charge, Organization and Activities of the Committee	3
II.	Summary of Research Team Reports and Questionnaire Responses	7
III.	Suggestions for making Unionization more effective	16
IV.	Unionization, Collective Bargaining, and Learned Societies	29
V.	Recommended Stance of the American Philosophical Association toward Faculty Unionization and Collective Bargaining in Institutions of Higher Learning	34
Minority Report (Fisk)		37
Personal Observation (Schacht)		38
Personal Observation (Gibson, Rorty & Scanlon)		40
Appendix A:	Reports of the Research Teams on 10 Target Institutions	42
	How to read this Appendix	42
	Questionnaire for Research Teams	43
	Report on California State College	46
	Report on Centralia College	51
	Report on Central Michigan University	55
	Report on Herbert Lehman College, CUNY	60
	Report on Illinois Valley Community College	65
	Report on Macomb County Community College	68
	Report on Rutgers University	72
	Report on St. John's University	78
	Report on Temple University	82
	Report on University of Hawaii	86
Appendix B:	Comparative Salary Data on some of the Target Institutions	92
Appendix C:	Analysis of Responses to APA Questionnaire	100
Appendix D:	Excerpts from the Bloland Report	136
Appendix E:	Excerpt from Report of the Tenure Commission, University of Pittsburgh dealing with part-time Faculty	138
Appendix F:	Short Bibliography of Publications about Faculty Unionization	140

FOREWORD

Perhaps no issue presently elicits more faculty interest and concern than that of academic unions and collective bargaining. In one way or another, faculty unionization has affected, or will soon affect, the professional lives of most members of the American Philosophical Association. Many APA members hold appointments in colleges and universities that have already adopted faculty unions. Other APA members teach in institutions whose faculties have, for the present, rejected unionization. Many more members are facing, or will soon face, the issue of collective bargaining on their campuses in the form of elections to determine whether their faculties should unionize. In preparing this report, the Ad Hoc Committee on Unionization and Collective Bargaining kept in view the needs, interests, and concerns of all the persons mentioned above. I believe that every member of the APA will find the Committee's report valuable when he or she confronts the complex phenomenon of faculty unionization.

As chairman of the Ad Hoc Committee, I want to express my official as well as personal gratitude to the 26 persons who served on the Committee. Almost without exception, these persons not only gave unstintingly of their time and energies but performed their respective tasks with intelligence and good cheer. It has been a singular privilege and pleasure for me to work with these philosophical colleagues. I believe that the quality of their contributions is evidenced by the good sense and thoroughness of the Committee's report. In my opinion, they have merited the respect and gratitude of the entire APA.

Because unionization is not discipline-specific, our academic colleagues in other disciplines will also be able to profit from the work of the Ad Hoc Committee. To facilitate this objective, the Committee's report will be made available to other learned societies through the good offices of the American Council of Learned Societies which provided substantial financial support to the Committee.

Finally, I want to thank Ms. Beatrice Schwartz who prepared the superb typescript of the report and who provided valuable secretarial assistance to the Committee over the past two years.

Gerald J. Massey
Chairperson

Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
May 7, 1976

ROSTER

AD HOC COMMITTEE ON UNIONIZATION AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING

Norman S. CARE, Associate Professor, Oberlin College

Irving M. COPI, Professor, U. of Hawaii

Steven DAVIS, Associate Professor, Simon Fraser U.

Theodore DRANGE, Professor, West Virginia U.

Myrna EVANS, Chairman, Illinois Valley Community College

Thomas A. FAY, Professor & Chairman, St. John's U.

John FISHER, Professor, Temple U.

Milton FISK, Professor, Indiana U.

Mary GIBSON, Assistant Professor, Livingston College, Rutgers U.

Holly S. GOLDMAN, Assistant Professor, U. of Michigan

Virginia HELD, Associate Professor, Graduate Center & Hunter College, CUNY

Ronald C. HOY, Associate Professor, California State College, Pennsylvania

Arthur LORD, Professor (retired), Centralia College

Maryellen MACGUIGAN, Assistant Professor, U. of Detroit

Gerald J. MASSEY, Professor & Chairman, U. of Pittsburgh (CHAIRPERSON)

Bruce L. MILLER, Associate Professor, Michigan State U.

Joyce H. PILLOTE, Associate Professor, Central Michigan U.

Vincent G. POTTER, Professor, Fordham U.

Charles RAFF, Professor, Swarthmore College

Amelie RORTY, Professor, Livingston College, Rutgers U.

David M. ROSENTHAL, Assistant Professor, Lehman College, CUNY

T. M. SCANLON, Associate Professor, Princeton U.

Richard SCHACHT, Associate Professor, U. of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Morton L. SCHAGRIN, Professor, SUNY at Fredonia

Phillip WAGAND, Professor, Macomb County Community College, Michigan

Donald A. WELLS, Professor & Chairman, U. of Hawaii at Hilo

I. ORIGINS, CHARGE, ORGANIZATION AND ACTIVITIES OF THE COMMITTEE

In recent years members of the American Philosophical Association have evinced lively interest in faculty unions and collective bargaining. Resolutions to support or promote faculty unionization have been introduced at business sessions of the annual Divisional meetings. In 1973 the Eastern Division passed a resolution mandating a symposium dealing with collective bargaining; the symposium was held during the December 1975 Divisional meeting. Further, in the Spring of 1973 the Eastern Division adopted by mail ballot a resolution endorsing unionization and calling for a committee to promote unionization. In response to this resolution the Executive Committee of the Eastern Division in September 1973 petitioned the Board of Officers of the APA to appoint an APA committee charged to acquaint itself with faculty unionization, to seek ways to encourage unionization, and to cooperate with other professional associations in pursuit of the goal of unionization. Thereupon, at its annual meeting in October 1973, the Board of Officers of the APA passed the following resolution which subsequently became the charge of the Ad Hoc Committee on Unionization and Collective Bargaining:

> Resolved that the Board of Officers authorize the establishment of a Subcommittee on Unionization and Collective Bargaining, this subcommittee to be under the Status and Future Committee, which would (a) acquaint itself with the present state of teachers' unions and collective bargaining on behalf of college and university teachers; (b) investigate ways in which the effectiveness of teachers' unions and collective bargaining agencies may be increased; (c) make appropriate recommendations to the Board of Officers and the Divisions regarding the Association's role with respect to unionization and collective bargaining; (d) cooperate with other professional associations which have already concerned themselves with these matters.

In order to implement the foregoing resolution the APA Board of Officers, with advice from the Status and Future Committee, in March 1973 designated Gerald Massey of the University of Pittsburgh to chair a committee charged to carry out tasks (a)-(d) of the resolution. With advice and assistance from Gerald McCallum, Chairperson of the Status and Future Committee, Professor Massey proposed that the Board of Officers appoint a large committee of 26 persons broadly representative of the membership of the Association. In addition to its chairperson, the proposed committee would include 10 two-person Research Teams and a five-person Planning and Drafting Team. Each Research Team would investigate the effects of unionization at one of ten unionized institutions selected to represent different kinds of institutions (two-year colleges, four-year colleges, universities, single-campus and multi-campus institutions, public and private

institutions), different bargaining agents (AAUP, AFT, NEA, and independent), and different geographical regions (the geographical pattern of unionization being taken into account). Besides planning the activities of the committee and drafting the several sections of the committee's report, the members of the Planning and Drafting Team would carry out specific assignments beyond the scope of the Research Teams' activities. The Board of Officers adopted the foregoing proposal and by September 1974 had appointed the following persons to two-year terms on the committee:

Ad Hoc Committee on Unionization and Collective Bargaining

Chairperson:
Gerald J. Massey, U. of Pittsburgh

Planning and Drafting Team
Norman Care, Oberlin College
Milton Fisk, Indiana U.
Mary Gibson, Rutgers U. (appointed November 1975)
Holly Goldman, U. of Michigan
Kathryn Parsons, Smith College (resigned October 1975)
Morton Schagrin, SUNY at Fredonia

Research Team, California State College, Pa. (NEA)
Theodore Drange, West Virginia U.
Ronald Hoy, California State College

Research Team, Centralia College, Wash. (NEA)
Steven Davis, Simon Fraser U.
Arthur Lord, Centralia College

Research Team, Central Michigan U. (NEA)
Bruce Miller, Michigan State U.
Joyce Pillote, Central Michigan U.

Research Team, Herbert Lehman College, CUNY (NEA-AFT)
Vincent Potter, Fordham U.
David Rosenthal, Herbert Lehman College

Research Team, Illinois Valley Community College (AFT)
Myrna Evans, Illinois Valley Community College
Richard Schacht, U. of Illinois

Research Team, Macomb County Community College, Mich. (Independent)
Maryellen MacGuigan, U. of Detroit
Phillip Wagand, Macomb County Community College

Research Team, Rutgers U. (AAUP)
Amelie Rorty, Rutgers U.
Thomas Scanlon, Princeton U.

Research Team, St. John's U. (AAUP)
Thomas Fay, St. John's U.
Virginia Held, Hunter College, CUNY

Research Team, Temple U. (AAUP)
John Fisher, Temple U.
Charles Raff, Swarthmore College

Research Team, U. of Hawaii (AFT; NEA-AAUP)
Irving Copi, U. of Hawaii
Donald Wells, Hilo College, U. of Hawaii

Initially the committee was known as the Subcommittee on Unionization and Collective Bargaining. But because the committee was not in any customary sense a subcommittee of a parent committee, the Board of Officers subsequently changed the name of the committee to Ad Hoc Committee on Unionization and Collective Bargaining so as better to reflect the nature and function of the committee.

In October 1974 the Planning and Drafting Team (Fisk, Goldman, Schagrin, and Massey present) met in Pittsburgh to formulate a detailed plan of action for the Committee. It prepared a list of questions to guide the inquiries of the ten Research Teams; these questions took the form of the questionnaire that appears in Appendix A. It also assigned specific tasks and responsibilities to its own members. Professor Care was asked to contact other learned societies and to coordinate APA initiatives with any of theirs (see Section IV). Professors Goldman and Schagrin were given responsibility to survey by mail the attitudes and opinions of the APA membership on issues raised by unionization and collective bargaining (see Appendix C). Professors Fisk and Parsons were asked to seek pertinent information from research groups and agencies that have a special concern for faculty unions. [Much later, Professor Gibson was asked to assemble comparative compensation statistics on the ten target institutions to indicate the effects of unionization on faculty compensation (see Appendix B).] All Committee members were expected to acquaint themselves with the growing body of literature dealing with faculty unions and collective bargaining. Appendix F contains a list of publications that individual Committee members recommend to others as especially informative or helpful.

In November 1974 the Research Teams began to assemble the information needed to reply to the questionnaire prepared by the Planning and Drafting Team. Though each Research Team had its own modus operandi, typically the "external" member paid several visits to the target institution where, in collaboration with the "internal" member of the Research Team, he or she met with philosophy faculty members, interviewed union and administrative officials, and examined local documents, the union contract included. By Summer 1975 all but one Research Team had completed their investigations and submitted their reports to the Committee. These reports appear in Appendix A.

From the time the Committee was created, efforts were made to secure external funding for the Committee's activities to supplement or supplant monies appropriated by the Eastern Division ($1,250) and the APA Board of Officers ($2,000). In response to a request for support, the American Council of Learned Societies in September 1975 appropriated $5,260 to underwrite a plenary meeting of the Committee and to help defray the expense of preparing and distributing the Committee's report. The Committee gratefully acknowledges this financial support.

To lay the groundwork for a fruitful plenary session of the Committee, the Planning and Drafting Team met in Pittsburgh (Goldman, Schagrin, and Massey present) in October 1975 to develop the agenda and procedures for the plenary meeting; suggestions were received by mail from all absent members of the Planning and Drafting Team as well as from many Research Team members. Professors Schagrin, Massey, and Goldman were asked to prepare preliminary drafts of Sections II, III, and IV, respectively, of this report. These drafts were sent to all Committee members in advance of the plenary meeting.

The plenary meeting was held the week-end of December 5-7, 1975 in the Sheraton-Cleveland Hotel in Cleveland, Ohio. Seventeen of the 26 members of the Committee were present, namely: Care, Davis, Drange, Fay, Goldman, Held, Hoy, Lord, Massey, Miller, Pillote, Raff, Rosenthal, Schacht, Schagrin, Wagand, and Wells. The Committee met continuously, with breaks only for meals and sleep, from 8:30 P.M. on Friday until 1:00 P.M. on Sunday, with each evening session running until 1:00 A.M. The Friday evening session was devoted to fleshing out the agenda and adopting procedures. At the close of the session each person was asked to give his or her preliminary view of what Section V of the report should contain. Besides sensitizing the group to the perspectives of its members, this exercise revealed, through the spectrum of views expressed, how genuinely representative of the APA membership the Committee was. During Saturday morning and afternoon the Committee was divided into two groups, one dealing with the preliminary drafts of Sections II and IV, the other with the preliminary draft of Section III. Thereafter. the Committee met as one group. first to adopt revised drafts of Sections II, III, and IV, then to address Section V. After several hours of debate. the Committee adopted, without any dissenting vote, the draft that appears as Section V of this report.

Time did not permit the Committee to produce in Cleveland finished drafts of Sections II-V. Accordingly, Professors Schagrin, Goldman, Care, and Massey were assigned the tasks of preparing revised drafts of Sections II, III, IV, and V respectively, and to distribute these drafts to the 17 members present in Cleveland for verification that they were faithful to the consensus reached in Cleveland. This authentication process was completed by the end of January 1976. In late February 1976 the body of this report, i.e., Sections I-V, was sent to all 26 members of the Committee for voting. (Section I was drafted by Professor Massey in February 1976.) Besides the option of accepting or rejecting the report, each Committee member was given the opportunity to abstain, to submit a minority report, or to append a personal observation.

As of May 5, 1976 all 26 members of the Ad Hoc Committee had cast their ballots. Twenty-four of the 26 members voted to accept the Committee's report. One member, Irving Copi, abstained from voting to accept or reject the report because he had been away from Hawaii during much of the Committee's active life and because he had been unable to attend the Cleveland meeting of the Committee. One member, Milton Fisk, voted to reject the report; Professor Fisk submitted a minority report which appears immediately after Section V of the Committee's report. While voting to accept the report, Professors Schacht, Gibson, Rorty, and Scanlon appended personal observations; these personal observations have been placed immediately after Professor Fisk's minority report.

II. SUMMARY OF RESEARCH TEAM REPORTS AND QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

A. Introduction and Caveat Lector

This section attempts to summarize the results of various investigations conducted by the Ad Hoc Committee. Subsection B summarizes the reports of the on-site Research Teams, whose complete reports comprise Appendix A. Some reference is also made to economic information collected by Mary Gibson; this information is presented in tabular form in Appendix B. Subsection C summarizes the data collected by means of a questionnaire sent to all members of the American Philosophical Association in the spring of 1975. The quantitative results of this survey, analyzed according to the traditional categories such as size of school, age of respondent, etc., are to be found in Appendix C.

The Ad Hoc Committee is obliged to warn against drawing firm conclusions, pro or con, from these results. Since the environment external to academia has been changing for the past several years, all responders in effect are trying to judge what would have been the case had there not been a union. For instance, if a particular matter is perceived as bad after unionization, it could have been even worse without the union. A converse example can be constructed; an improvement attributed to the union might have come anyway. The external environment has, nevertheless, been exerting a downward pressure on academic affairs, so perhaps more weight should be placed on responses which suggest that unionization has led to improvement.

B. On-site Research Team Reports

1. Summary of Background Information

Noting the increasing number of faculty members who are members of unions and the growing number of campuses selecting a bargaining agent, many observers have concluded that faculty are deliberately choosing unionization as an effective way to obtain benefits, or protect previously established rights. Reports from several campuses suggest that changes in state laws (e.g., New York's Taylor Law) were perceived as, in effect, forcing faculties to unionize. That is, changes in state laws regarding public employees were perceived as making the "No Agent" choice an unrealistic political option, and that the real issue became which agent to select. In this regard, it should be noted that the system-wide administrations of a multi-unit system would prefer to deal with a single agent for all units, whereas the administrators and faculty of separate units often prefer their own agent. When one agent represents several units, distinctive local concerns are sometimes not adequately represented.

When conditions prior to the decision to unionize indicate a weak faculty governance structure, the major impetus towards unionization has often been a concern as much for faculty rights as for economic gain, although in some cases, the concerns have been almost exclusively economic. In the absence of severe economic threat, faculty have exhibited a strong concern to defend or

increase their significant role in the development of educational and personnel policies and procedures.

Philosophers in particular, when they have actively been engaged in the question of whether to unionize, can be found on both sides of the question. When a union exists, however, philosophers tend to be supportive of its efforts.

When a union is being formed and the first contract is being negotiated, a cooperative administration that is sensitive to faculty needs and concerns can help the eventual outcome. When an adversary relationship exists or is created at the very beginning, the eventual contract is less satisfying to all parties. The potential adversary to the faculty, it should be noted, will vary according to the specific situation. In some cases it will be a Board of Trustees or Regents rather than "the Administration."

The organizing, studying and debating prior to the selection of an agent (or, no agent) takes considerable time and energy. After an agent has been selected, not much more time than is normally spent on governance seems to be required, with the important exception of those directly involved with the negotiating team. The general perception of respondents was that working with an established union did not place great demands on their time, nor did it interfere greatly with their teaching and research.

2. Summary of Union Activity

It was remarked that students have no influence on the bargaining. In some cases, students have an "observer" status, but have no real influence on the contract. Students, of course, can exert pressure directly on legislatures (or trustees) but they apparently cannot sit at the bargaining table. (This may give rise to a Student Union movement, signs of which are appearing in Michigan and New York.)

With a union, there is no loss of allegiance to the discipline (philosophy), or a diminution of interest in learned societies (the APA). This finding does not support the speculations of the Blolands discussed in greater detail in Section IV.

Since contracts involve more than economic issues, it should be pointed out that students are not necessarily excluded from governance with the appearance of a bargaining agent. Contracts have been written confirming local governance procedures such as the inclusion of students on various committees.

3. Summary of Teaching and Research

In situations where conditions for teaching and research were already reasonably good, unionization had little effect. Where conditions were felt to be less than adequate, improvements were achieved through unionization. Maximum classroom hours, maximum student contacts, and credit for advising time were some of the areas mentioned as explicitly defined in the contract.

4. Summary of Governance

With a contract, in some cases some functions of a faculty senate (or other faculty governing body) were surrendered to the union, especially grievances. Where no procedure for grievance existed before, a contract universally required them. No easy generalization can be made concerning the strengthening or weakening of pre-existing governance structures. The result depends on the nature of the governing body and its traditional role, and the scope of the contract. More often than not, contracts have brought about greater participation by faculty in the selection of chairpersons and other administrators.

A professional norm, or ideal, is the collegial model wherein faculty work cooperatively with administrators. After unionization, however, at least half of those surveyed reported polarization between the faculty and the administration.

There seems to be room for contracting for greater flexibility in curricular change and innovation. Yet, where reported, flexibility has remained the same or has been perceived as diminished. The general economic conditions may be responsible for this phenomenon, rather than the mere presence of a union.

5. Summary of Appointments, Promotion and Tenure

The results regarding the effect of the union on standards for tenure and promotion are mixed. Some report more stringent requirements (or the same standards applied more stringently); some report looser review; others report no change. To some extent this variation in effect may depend on the scope and structure of changes introduced by grievance clauses. At least there appears to be a positive value in making the procedures for personnel recommendations explicit. One potential danger is that fear of becoming involved in grievance cases may have led some departments and administrators to make favorable decisions, which they otherwise would not have made. The converse danger of course also exists; unfavorable decisions may be made if there are no requirements for justifications.

Some contracts have clauses supportive of Affirmative Action, but in many cases, the relevant clauses go no further than Federal regulations require. Obviously contracts could be stronger than this, but none reported this situation.

Reports indicate that contracts guarantee individuals access to their own personnel files. There are no indications in the reports as to whether or not this procedure is beneficial. For further information on this question, see Subsection C below and items 40 and 41 in Appendix C.

Unions tend to oppose tenure and rank quotas, and usually make retrenchment procedures explicit. Retrenchment procedures vary from the industrial model of last-in-first-out to that of complete departmental autonomy. No evidence exists to confirm the

effectiveness or ineffectiveness of unions in preventing quotas. The absence of evidence may be due partly to the lack of very many attempts to impose quotas, whereas the effectiveness of unions in regard to retrenchment procedures may be more noticeable because of the greater attention recently paid to this issue by management. See also items 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, in Appendix C.

When part-time staff are covered by the union, they are often affected favorably. When they are not represented by the bargaining agent (being either explicitly excluded or just not included), they have little protection or recourse.

6. Summary of Economic Aspects

Unionization has led, in many cases, to substantial salary increases, especially when the salary scale at an institution is lower than that of "comparable" institutions. In some cases, fringe benefits were also significantly improved. All reporting institutions have salary floors, some newly created by the contract.

The pattern of salary increases under unionization tends to be one of across-the-board increases with little or no provision for merit or discretionary increases. Indications, in general, are that unionization tends to lead to the determination of salaries solely by rank and length of service, but the effect is not entirely clear. Some contracts, for instance, do not limit initial offers to people coming in from the outside. Furthermore, the tendency to eliminate merit increases (10 of 10 reports) seems stronger than any tendency towards the elimination of previously existing salary differentials.

Union dues vary considerably. They can range from nominal ($15/year) to substantial ($150/year). The reasons for this variation should be investigated further. Various rate structures were also reported: flat fee, percentage of salary (with a maximum limit), etc.

Data available from AAUP Bulletins for the past several years show that, for seven of the institutions studied, overall average compensation has improved with a contract from positions below, or slightly above, average to well above average. Some tendency towards leveling the differences between ranks is evident, but this has not generally been at the expense of substantial increases for higher ranks. See Appendix B for comparisons among institutions studied, and for rank comparisons within institutions.

C. Summary of Responses to Questionnaire sent to all APA Members

In addition to the general caveat in the Introduction to this section, some further warnings are in order. The responses reported in Appendix C and summarized here are only the opinions

of the respondents. If some answers indicate "No Change," this must be understood as no perceived change. Furthermore, the total number of responses from unionized campuses is too small to permit any firm conclusions, even about faculty opinions.

1. Attitude toward Unionization

Item 10: At this time with regard to unionization on your campus, are you generally (A) in favor, (B) opposed, (C) undecided?

For respondents from non-unionized campuses (N=698), 37.8% were in favor, 33.3% were opposed, and 28.9% were undecided. Respondents from unionized campuses (N=145) divide: 64.5% in favor, 25.5% opposed, and 9.2% undecided. The faculty from Ph.D. granting institutions tend to be less favorable towards unions. Small departments on unionized campuses tend to be strongly in favor of unions, while this is not the case on non-unionized campuses. Rank and age tend to be inversely related to a favorable attitude on both unionized and non-unionized campuses. Faculty with 4-7 years of service are strongly pro-union on unionized campuses (several obvious hypotheses suggest themselves here).

2. Effect on Collegial Relationships

13. In general, have faculty-administration relationships (A) improved, (B) deteriorated, (C) remained the same?

(A) 17% (B) 42% (C) 40%

14. Faculty control over educational policies has (A) increased, (B) decreased, (C) remained about the same.

(A) 27% (B) 22% (C) 51%

15. Faculty control over budgetary priorities has (A) increased, (B) decreased, (C) remained the same.

(A) 22% (B) 23% (C) 55%

16. If your institution had a faculty governing body before unionization, is its power at this time (A) more, (B) less, (C) about the same?

(A) 10% (B) 41% (C) 50%

17. Since unionization, is the amount of flexibility in curricular innovation (A) more, (B) less, (C) about the same.

(A) 9% (B) 19% (C) 73%

3. Effect on Salaries

18. Was there a policy of merit increases prior to unionization? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 67% (B) 33%

19. Does your contract provide for merit increases? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 53% (B) 47%

20. (If applicable) Under unionization, the size of merit increases is (A) greater, (B) less, (C) about the same as before.

(A) 19% (B) 49% (C) 33% [No responses (53)]

21. (If applicable) Would you attribute the change in merit increases to unionization? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 64% (B) 36%

22. In making offers to prospective faculty members, is departmental flexibility (A) greater, (B) less, (C) about the same?

(A) 5% (B) 26% (C) 69% [No responses (11)]

23. In meeting offers from other institutions to current staff, is the amount of departmental flexibility under the contract (A) greater, (B) less, (C) about the same as before?

(A) 4% (B) 30% (C) 66% [No responses (21)]

24. Compared with the situation prior to unionization, is your teaching workload (A) greater, (B) less, (C) about the same?

(A) 12% (B) 9% (C) 79% [No responses (6)]

25. If your workload has changed, would you attribute this directly to unionization? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 31% (B) 69%

26. Has unionization resulted in a faculty whose quality is (A) higher, (B) lower, (C) about the same as before?

(A) 6% (B) 18% (C) 76%

27. Had you not unionized, do you think your current salary would be (A) higher, (B) lower, (C) about the same?

(A) 12% (B) 54% (C) 34%

4. Effect on Tenure and Promotion Policies

28. Prior to unionization, was there any avenue of appeal on the occasion of the non-reappointment of non-tenured faculty? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 63% (B) 37%

29. Under your contract, are there circumstances under which non-reappointment is appealable (or grievable)? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 94% (B) 6%

30. Are you aware of any retrenchment policies your institution had prior to unionization? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 28% (B) 72%

31. If your contract contains provisions for retrenchment, the procedures specified are (A) good, (B) poor, (C) satisfactory (acceptable under the circumstances).

(A) 16% (B) 22% (C) 62% [No Responses (32)]

32. Does your institution have an explicit quota on ranks? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 15% (B) 85%

33. Would you attribute the situation described in item 32 to the union? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 19% (B) 81% [No Responses 22)]

34. Does your institution have an explicit quota on tenured faculty? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 10% (B) 90%

35. Would you attribute the situation described in item 34 to the union? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 22% (B) 78% [No Responses (21)]

5. Miscellaneous Issues

36. Does your contract support Affirmative Action programs? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 70% (B) 30%

37. Does your contract outline procedures for handling student grievances? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 25% (B) 75%

38. Since unionization, in responding to student grievances and complaints has your institution been (A) more vigorous, (B) less vigorous, (C) about the same as before?

(A) 10% (B) 3% (C) 87% [No Response (20)]

39. After unionization, are relations between students and faculty (A) better, (B) worse, (C) about the same?

(A) 14% (B) 15% (C) 72%

40. Does your contract guarantee faculty members access to their own files? (A) Yes, (B) No.

(A) 70% (B) 30%

41. If faculty members are guaranteed access to their files, obtaining outside letters for promotional decisions has been (A) fairly difficult, (B) somewhat difficult, (C) not difficult.

(A) 13% (B) 13% (C) 75% [No Response (71)]

42. How (if at all) has unionization affected the roles and operation of departmental committees and general faculty committees?

Favorable	Unfavorable	No Change	Too Early to say	No Response
26%	28%	39%	7%	(18)

43. How (if at all) has the selection of department heads and other administrative officials been affected?

24%	8%	63%	5%	(23)

44. DEPARTMENT HEADS: How (if at all) has unionization affected your role and relations both with your staff and the administration?

22%	34%	42%	2%	(85)

6. Finer analysis of selected questions

Item 13: Responses from departments with 1-3 staff members run to 30% improvement of faculty-administration relations, while only 3% of those from large departments (16 or more) report improvement.

Item 14: Only 13% of those from Ph.D.-granting institutions report increased faculty control over educational policies. Furthermore, comparing small departments (1-3) with large departments (16 or more), we find

	Increased Control	Decreased	Same
Small	52%	17%	31%
Large	12%	28%	60%

Item 16: Both rank and years of service tend to correlate directly with a perception that the Faculty Senate is now weaker.

Item 24: Assistant professors and full professors differ from the general percentages in their attitudes towards teaching loads.

	Greater Load	Less	Same
Ass't. Profs.	9%	23%	68%
Professors	17%	2%	81%

Also, of those with 8 or more years of service, 5% report a reduced teaching load. (We are obviously counting the same people twice.)

Item 27: The perception of the effect of unionization on salaries does not appear to vary with the size of the institution. Yet, the percentage of those who believe their salaries would have been lower without a union, varies with the highest degree awarded:

A.A.	75%
B.A.	67%
M.A.	51%
Ph.D.	43%

Item 31: Different age groups have different opinions about the retrenchment procedures in the contract. The percentages of those who think the procedures are poor are:

Under 35 years	33%
36-45 years	22%
46 and older	14%

A similar decline in negative opinion is found with increasing rank and years of service.

Item 39: With increasing rank and more years of service, relatively more respondents believe student-faculty relations are worse. A preponderant majority, however, report no change.

Item 44: Full professors tend to have a more negative view than the overall average of the effect of unionization on the role and relations of department heads with staff and administration.

III. SUGGESTIONS FOR MAKING UNIONIZATION MORE EFFECTIVE

Part (b) of the APA charge to the Ad Hoc Committee directed the latter to "investigate ways in which the effectiveness of teachers' unions and collective bargaining agencies may be increased." Depending on the circumstances of the institution, unionization can bring about significant improvements in the economic and professional conditions of the faculty. These gains, however, sometimes have adverse consequences, often because such consequences were unforeseen and so unaddressed in the contract. Accordingly, in this section the Committee reviews a number of possible benefits as well as possible drawbacks of unionization. Where practicable, the Committee suggests ways to maximize the benefits and to minimize the disadvantages. The issues are complicated by the fact that, because faculty members embrace different values, what seems an advantage to one person may appear as a disadvantage to another. Hence in cases where the possibility of such disagreement seems significant, the Committee's suggestions have been stated in hypothetical form. Moreover, contract provisions which promote one value may detract from another; thus the suggestions should be understood as "ceteris paribus" recommendations. These suggestions are based on the results of the survey questionnaire, the data obtained by the Research Teams, review of available scholarly literature, and the experience of members of the Ad Hoc Committee.

Suggestion 1. Whenever the question of collective bargaining is raised seriously at a campus, and time permits, a neutral faculty body should undertake an in-depth study of faculty unionization. The study should be factual and should not take sides on the question of whether the faculty should organize or on the question of which would-be agent would best represent the faculty, except insofar as the facts themselves speak for one or more of these alternatives. It should include comparative economic data, an analysis of the effectiveness of existing forms of faculty governance at the institution, working conditions at the institution, and the likely implications of unionization for these matters.

If time does not permit the undertaking of such a study, the faculty body should at least make available such studies as have been conducted at similar institutions, in addition to making available, and directing faculty members to, the most valuable publications on faculty unions and collective bargaining.

Comment: In the absence of such a study, faculty members typically find themselves at the time of a labor election informed only by the pro-union propaganda of competing would-be agents and the anti-union propaganda of a hostile administration or faculty group organized to combat unionization. The kind of study recommended in Suggestion 1 will help faculty members separate veridical from spurious claims of the antagonists, and so help them reach an intelligent, informed decision on a matter of great import to their academic careers and to the general welfare of institutions of higher learning in our society. Moreover, should the faculty opt

for collective bargaining, such a study can sensitize faculty members about items to be insisted upon during contract negotiations. Appendix F contains a list of studies of this nature which have already been carried out.

Suggestion 2: Faculty members should weigh the expected economic advantages to them from unionization against the disadvantages unionization may entail for other persons, such as students, non-academic staff, unemployed philosophers, and new Ph.D.'s seeking positions in institutions of higher learning. When possible, action to alleviate the hardships imposed on others should be vigorously taken. When no amelioration is possible, faculty members face a difficult moral choice which they ought to address explicitly and generously.

Comment: The monies necessary to finance significant economic gains that may be won through unionization must come from somewhere. A faculty responsible to the traditional aims of American higher education cannot remain indifferent to the likely source of these funds. In a period of economic growth, increased economic benefits for the faculty might be financed out of an expanding institutional budget. However, the present period is one of economic hardship, and institutional budgets are likely to remain fixed or to decrease. Thus, in private institutions, substantial tuition increases, reduction of supporting services, or retrenchment of nonacademic or even academic employees may be the only sources of the funds necessary to implement economic gains won at the bargaining table. In such cases, the faculty might weigh its economic gains against the hardships imposed on other groups. In public institutions, greater legislative appropriations are another source of such funds. In the present climate of support for higher education, however, looser legislative pursestrings are sometimes an unrealistic alternative to those already mentioned for private institutions. Economic gains may be financed through faculty attrition (leading to deteriorating faculty-student ratios), faculty retrenchment, and reduction of essential services. To the extent that educational appropriations increase, it may be at the expense of other important public institutions less able to organize and place pressure on legislatures (e.g., the welfare system, prisons).

Also, faculty members should be aware that their economic gains may lead to management's or legislative pressure for greater "productivity" which may be interpreted quantitatively, e.g., in terms of contact hours or student credit hours. Faculty unions provide an organized body to resist such pressure, but they can also indirectly contribute to such pressure by providing administrations or legislatures with a context in which it seems appropriate to grant demands only in trade for the satisfaction of demands of their own.

Finally, one should not overlook the fact that unionization adds the not-inconsiderable expenses of collective bargaining to the customary costs of operating an institution of higher learning.

To the degree that higher salaries and fringe benefits won through unionization are financed, at least in part, through faculty attrition, faculty lay-offs, and hiring freezes, the plight of the unemployed philosophers and new Ph.D.'s is aggravated. The pool of unemployed philosophers is increased, and the number of available positions decreased. The net result may be that increasingly fewer people share an increasingly larger share of a relatively constant monetary pie. Or, in other words, the have-academics may become more affluent while the have-nots become even more disadvantaged. It would be otherwise if unionization could be counted on to bring about a significant rate of expansion of the relevant economic pie. But, though such figures are notoriously subject to incompatible interpretations, statistics published recently in the Chronicle of Higher Education (November 10, 1975) indicate that in those states where faculty unionization has been most pronounced, namely New York, New Jersey, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, Massachusetts, Michigan, Washington, and Hawaii, the record over the past two years shows that:

(a) With respect to percent increases in legislative appropriations to higher education, of the eight states named above only Hawaii (7th in nation) ranked above average, New York (26th) ranked average, and the rest ranked well below average, Pennsylvania (33rd), Washington (35th), Michigan (36th), Massachusetts (44th), Wisconsin (47th), with New Jersey (50th) a distant last.

(b) With respect to per capita legislative appropriations, the union-intensive states fared better. Hawaii (2nd) ranked extremely high, as did Washington (4th). Wisconsin (13th), New York (17th) were well above average, Michigan (26th) was average, Pennsylvania (35th) ranked well below average, while New Jersey (48th) and Massachusetts (49th) were near the bottom.

(c) With respect to legislative appropriations per $1000 of personal income, the results were again mixed. Hawaii (6th), and Washington (9th) ranked high, Wisconsin (13th) was well above average, New York (29th) just below average, Michigan (35th) and Pennsylvania (37th) below average and Massachusetts (48th) and New Jersey (49th) were at the bottom of the scale.

The statistics summarized above suggest that in many cases economic gains won through faculty unionization will be financed in some of the ways described above that are prejudicial to academic have-nots, i.e., the most vulnerable junior faculty, unemployed philosophers, and new Ph.D.'s. A concrete illustration may help to make the point. Suppose the union contract calls for an 8% across the board salary increase for 1976-1977, but that after good-faith budget trimming steps the administration can muster monies equivalent only to a 6% increase. Then, through lay-offs and attrition, faculty size will

be reduced by approximately 3% in order to meet the terms of the contract. There might nevertheless be a general willingness among the faculty to accept a smaller increase that would necessitate neither lay-offs nor elimination of faculty posts, but implementation of that sentiment might be precluded by the legally binding terms of a too hastily thought-out contract.

Suggestion 3. Economic benefits available to faculty members through unionization must be weighed against possible cut-backs in support services implemented to finance those benefits.

Comment: For the same reasons cited in the previous comment, monies previously used for educational support services (library funds, secretarial help, graderships, graduate research and teaching assistantships, etc.) may be used to finance direct economic benefits for the faculty.

Suggestion 4: Unions themselves can work effectively with outside agencies to help prevent the undesirable phenomena noted in Suggestions 2 and 3.

Comment: Unions can work to promote their own interests as well as broader institutional goals through means beyond the process of collective bargaining itself. Faculty unions in public institutions can lobby directly with legislative bodies for increased funding and against unreasonable productivity standards, or cooperate with the administration's efforts to present the institution's case before the legislature. Faculty unions in private institutions may find parallel activities available to them, e.g., cooperating with efforts to raise funds from major foundations or governmental agencies, or lobbying with legislative bodies to secure legislation favorable to higher education.

Suggestion 5: To promote excellence in teaching and scholarship, faculty members should try to ensure that the contract, the initial contract included, incorporates provisions supportive of such excellence.

Comment: Important items for which contract provisions should be made include reasonable teaching loads and class sizes, regular paid sabbatical leaves, significant funds to support research projects (especially summer-term projects), clerical support adequate for both teaching and research needs, adequate office space, travel and per diem allowances for attendance at professional meetings, reimbursement for payment of professional society dues and subscriptions to professional journals, and funds for colloquium speakers, guest lecturers, and visiting faculty appointments. (Some of these suggestions are reaffirmed in Section IV of this report.)

The reason that the initial contract is mentioned in Suggestion 5 is that experience has shown that initial contracts often are addressed primarily to bread-and-butter economic issues, to the detriment of non-economic and less obvious economic issues that

relate significantly to the professional well-being of the faculty. Those concerned with these issues should work to see that they are covered by the initial contract, even if this means a longer delay between certification of the bargaining agent and approval of the first contract. The research of the Committee seems to indicate that such delays do not adversely affect the well-being of the faculty. Furthermore, inclusion of such professional provisions in the initial contract may help allay the fears and even hostility of those faculty who see collective bargaining as subversive of their status as professionals.

Suggestion 6: Faculty members who value tenure as a device to assure academic freedom, economic security, and faculty excellence, should try to ensure that the union contract supports the tenure system.

Comment: One proposed contract weakened the tenure system by introducing a category of renewable non-tenure stream extended appointments; it led, however, to decertification of the bargaining agent and the certification of an agent more sympathetic to the tenure system. Such undermining of tenure is rare, but covert subversion of the tenure system can readily take place unless the contract is designed to support the tenure system. There are several ways tenure can be subverted. First, the contract may provide that retrenchment proceed inversely to seniority (years of service) at the institution. In such cases a tenured professor who recently joined the faculty may be laid off before a non-tenured faculty member with more years of service at the institution. Not only does this weaken the meaning of a tenured appointment, but it also represents a clear threat to the mobility prized by many academics. Few established scholars and teachers would choose in times of academic recession to move to a position which left them so vulnerable to retrenchment. Institutions with this system will have a correspondingly difficult time attracting such faculty members. Second, some contracts make the tenure probation period so short, and the criteria and standards for achieving it so weak, that virtually anyone appointed to the faculty becomes tenured. In such circumstances, the traditional objective of the tenure system to ensure that only high quality faculty receive permanent appointments is effectively undermined. To forestall this, the faculty can insist that the contract incorporate traditional tenure criteria, standards, and probation periods (e.g., by incorporating the 1940 AAUP policy statement on tenure), that the place of professional judgment in tenure decisions is clearly defined and respected, and that matters of professional judgment are not grievable. A well-designed contract can enhance the tenure system by articulating, better than they sometimes are formulated, the procedures, criteria, and standards for appointments, re-appointment, promotion, retention, and tenure. The contract should protect faculty against arbitrary administrative action, yet not make administrative review of personnel actions so fraught with potential grievances that faculty committees, deans, presidents, and the like are discouraged from fulfilling their fiduciary responsibility to maintain and enhance the quality of the faculty.

Suggestion 7: Because students are not a party to contract negotiations, their interests may be overlooked and even injured. Accordingly, to take seriously the legitimate interests of students, the faculty should try to do the following:

(a) insure that students have ample and timely information about the provisions of the proposed contract, and adequate opportunity to make their interests with respect to those provisions known, and

(b) ensure that the contract includes provisions that are clearly in the students' interests, e.g., manageable class sizes, reasonable teaching loads that enable faculty members to teach effectively, etc.

Comment: Above and beyond the economic factors mentioned in Suggestion 2, students are affected by many possible provisions in faculty contracts (e.g., the college calendar, grading policy, use of teaching evaluations in personnel actions, the nature of institutional governance, and the general quality of teaching conditions). Mechanisms should be created for soliciting students' opinions and giving appropriate weight to their interests in arriving at the final contract.

Suggestion 8: To promote Affirmative Action goals, faculty members should try to ensure that the contract makes specific provisions for them.

Comment: To remedy salary and rank inequities due to previous discrimination, the contract can provide that a specified sum of money be set aside for remedying such inequities, and stipulate machinery for righting the inequities. Further, so that recent gains in employing women and HEW-designated minorities might not be eroded by retrenchment, the contract might specify that the before- and after-retrenchment percentages of such faculty groups remain constant. (Note that since most such persons are non-tenured, this action would erode somewhat the security aspect of tenure.)

Largely with a view toward Affirmative Action goals, faculty might press for inclusion in the contract of provisions for paid maternity and paternity leaves, for day care centers for children of faculty, staff, and students, and for liberal regulations governing leaves without pay both for scholarly and personal reasons. Consideration might also be given to replacing the tenure system with some alternative device for assuring the same goals that would be less inimicable to women and members of minority groups. Because only a minority of the faculty profit directly from provisions like those described above, there may be majority opposition to them in some bargaining units. Hence it may be prudent for women to press for a broadly based bargaining unit that goes beyond faculty to include librarians and other categories of non-teaching professionals that contain large numbers of women. Such composition of the bargaining unit would give women greater influence over contract provisions. (But see the dangers inherent in this strategy detailed in Suggestion 20.)

Of special concern to women is the status of part-time faculty. When part-time faculty members are excluded from the bargaining unit, they are often disadvantaged by the contract which is negotiated primarily to advance the interests of the members of the bargaining unit. Hence it is obviously in the interest of part-time faculty members to be included in the bargaining unit. Since the composition of the bargaining unit is often decided by a state or federal officer on the ground of substantial community of interests, the probability that part-time faculty will be included in the bargaining unit might be increased by distinguishing between regular part-time and irregular part-time faculty members, and by pressing for inclusion of the former within the bargaining unit.

In this regard the policy statement adopted in 1974 by the Board of Officers of the APA, and reaffirmed in 1975, is relevant: "Rates of compensation for part-time teaching, including fringe benefits, should be established and maintained at ratios equivalent to those for full-time faculty teaching with equivalent training and experience. Reductions in the rates of compensation (including fringe benefits) should occur only in cases where there is a disproportionately large reduction or waiver of nonteaching responsibilities." A model of the kind of contract provision that could be adopted for regular part-time faculty, taken from the Report of the Tenure Commission of the University of Pittsburgh, is included in Appendix E.

Suggestion 9: Faculty members should employ unions wherever possible to alleviate the plight of unemployed teachers and new Ph.D.'s.

Comment: In particular, union members might urge the following steps be taken:

(a) that contracts contain provisions likely to result in the employment of more persons relative to a fixed total salary allotment, e.g., clauses establishing part-time and shared appointments, attractive voluntary early retirement plans, and innovative sabbatical systems,

(b) that unions pressure professional societies and universities to provide prospective graduate students with full and vivid information concerning their eventual prospects for finding academic employment, and

(c) that unions cooperate (e.g., by providing grants-in aid) with professional organizations attempting to expand job opportunities for persons with graduate degrees, for example in primary and secondary education and in the civil service.

Unions could be a powerful and effective force in pressing for such remedies. Insofar as unions may exacerbate the plight of unemployed teachers and new Ph.D.'s, they seem to have a special moral obligation to do so.

Suggestion 10. Faculty members who value meritocratic practices and policies should try to ensure that the contract contains provisions for the differential reward and recognition of scholarly and teaching performance. Such recognition might take the form of either non-economic rewards and incentives (such as research leaves or assignment to teach honors classes), or more centrally economic strategies (such as significant merit salary increases, accelerated promotion of unusually deserving teachers or scholars, administrative flexibility in meeting outside offers, absence of ceilings on salaries within ranks, and flexibility in determining individual teaching loads).

Comment: The Committee's research confirmed the widely held belief that unionization tends toward egalitarian practices and policies. Even when initial contracts provide for merit increases, it is not uncommon to find them missing from subsequent contracts. In the long run, faculty unionization will probably make salary and rank a function of years of service. Accordingly, those who think meritocratic practices such as differential salary increases, accelerated promotion, etc. are necessary to attract the best young minds into philosophy, or to retain the services of the ablest members of the faculty, or to attract distinguished teachers or scholars away from other institutions, or to elicit the best teaching and scholarship from the faculty, should try to make provisions like those in Suggestion 10 a part, not only of the initial contract, but of subsequent contracts as well. Though such efforts appear to be an uphill struggle, there are no reasons of principle for them to fail. Indeed, some non-industrial unions, e.g., musicians' unions, have successfully combined unionization with meritocratic practices. Whether this can be done over the long run in academic unions remains to be seen. It will not be done unless those who prize meritocratic practices band together to work for their inclusion in contracts.

Provision of meritocratic policies like those mentioned above would likely allay some of the hostility of opponents of unionization, especially in major universities and prestige four-year colleges. But it is perhaps likely to alienate other faculty who value egalitarianism in such matters.

Suggestion 11: Concern for professional working conditions should extend to such facilities and educational services as libraries, laboratories, and computer centers, clerical and administrative staff support, office space and equipment, and professional liability insurance. Hence, faculty members should try to see that the contract assures the adequacy of these facilities and services.

Comment: Such facilities and services may be taken for granted during negotiations. Yet experience has shown that occasionally economic gains won at the bargaining table are financed in part

by substantial cuts in the funding of such facilities and services, to the detriment of teaching and research. The availability of library materials and reserve book arrangements, computer time, and audio-visual services is clearly an aspect of faculty working conditions. Rather than being taken for granted, they should be explicitly secured at the bargaining table.

We live in litigious times, so much so that lawsuits have become a common feature of academic life across the country. Nevertheless, because the provisions of a labor contract have the force of law, one can reasonably anticipate more litigation on unionized campuses than on non-unionized ones. Accordingly, it seems important to make professional liability coverage part of the fringe-benefit package prescribed by the contract. Though by no means relevant only to them, department chairpersons in the bargaining unit should definitely be accorded such coverage.

Suggestion 12: Should a faculty adopt unionization, effort should be made to avoid counterproductive hostility on either side between the bargaining unit and the agency with which it negotiates contracts, e.g., the administration, board of trustees, or legislature.

Comment: One of the faculty's greatest assets can be an administration (or other agency) which identifies with its interests. The research of the Committee seems to indicate as well that a contract which best serves both the faculty and the administration is negotiated most easily and effectively when the administration assumes a non-hostile, cooperative stance toward the legitimate concerns and aspirations of the faculty. By the same token, the faculty must be realistic about the administration's aims and limitations. Accordingly, effort should be made to preserve any pre-existing identification of faculty-administration interests. Similarly, both the administration and the union should be educated to perceive where their interests coincide, and to recognize that hostility toward each other will likely damage the interests of all parties to the negotiations. So as to make cooperative accommodation more likely, divisive rhetoric during the period of organizing ought to be eschewed.

Suggestion 13: Faculty members who value collegiality and shared authority in the governance of the institution should try to see that the provisions of the 1971 AAUP Statement on the Governance of Colleges and Universities are incorporated into the contract.

Comment: Where there has been some semblance of collegiality and shared authority in the governance of an institution, unionization has generally tended to erode collegiality and to increase polarization between faculty and administration. However, there is little doubt that unionization has brought about shared authority (and in some cases collegiality) in many institutions where previously the faculty was voiceless and powerless, notably in two-year colleges and community colleges. Moreover, the lack of an effective voice in institutional governance seems to have been a principal stimulus for unionization, an observation that runs counter to the folklore

that academic collective bargaining is largely precipitated by poor economic conditions. In such instances one can hope that shared authority will eventually lead to collegiality, as the adversaries come to know and respect one another, and to recognize that the good of the institution is the overriding concern of both parties.

Nevertheless there is reason to expect that faculty unionization may erode collegiality and perhaps even shared authority in institutions that have a long and deep tradition of faculty governance and where the administration identifies with the aims and aspirations of the faculty.

Many have feared that unionization will weaken faculty senates and other traditional organs of faculty governance. The research of the Ad Hoc Committee suggests that this need not happen. Provided that the contract spells out sensitively the sphere of senate activity and authority, faculty senates and bargaining agents can not only co-exist but can complement each other's activities in the overall interest of the faculty and the institution. The radius of the Senate's sphere of activity may be smaller, but its effectiveness need not be reduced. In fact, by channelling its activities into well-defined areas, the Senate may find its vigor increased.

Suggestion 14: Those who value institutional integrity and autonomy should try to ensure that unionization does not undermine them either directly or indirectly.

Comment: The danger to institutional autonomy and integrity looms especially large in state-wide systems where contract negotiations are conducted between a state-level bargaining team and agents of the executive branch of the state government. Because local (and sometimes even high-level system-wide) administrators play little or no role in such negotiations the perspective of the local administration goes unrepresented. The same is true of the perspective of the local unions. In such cases, individual campuses may find that far-reaching decisions adverse to local interests are made without their having any effective way to influence them. Much the same may be true of branch campuses of a multi-campus university where the union effectively represents the interests of the faculty at the main campus whose community of interest with their branch campus colleagues may be insubstantial. Adverse consequences may range from locally undesirable system-wide retrenchment plans to intrusion in the right to make or reject faculty appointments. For example, the contract may require a campus to fill an academic vacancy by a person retrenched at another campus in the system. Further, by giving priority in appointment anywhere in the system to persons retrenched elsewhere in the system, the contract may deny appointment opportunities to other unemployed philosophers and new Ph.D.'s. Such retrenchment plans may also have repercussions, either pro or con, for affirmative action goals.

Suggestion 15: Those who value clear, non-arbitrary, and regular mechanisms for dealing with grievances will welcome the opportunity offered by unionization for careful formulation of such procedures, and should give close attention to this aspect of the contract; those who value the informality of traditional academic administration and governance should attempt to reduce its loss under unionization by providing maximum scope for informality under the new regulations, especially those dealing with the resolution of minor differences or grievances.

Comment: One value of a union contract consists in the clear articulation of grievance procedures. Such grievance procedures seem to work most effectively and harmoniously when they first prescribe informal efforts to resolve the grievance before the formal grievance machinery is set in motion.

Suggestion 16: The contract should specify that access to personnel files is restricted to authorized review bodies with a need to know, and possibly to the subject of the file. To promote fair, non-arbitrary decisions, the person's access to his or her own file is important; but assuring such access can undermine confidentiality held by some to be crucial to an effective conduct of appointment, retention, and promotion processes.

Comment: Unless one has adequate opportunity to "confront one's accusers," it is difficult to fight effectively questionable personnel decisions—to answer charges, produce counter-evidence, determine the reliability of witnesses and referees. Thus union contracts tend to stress openness in personnel matters, e.g., by permitting faculty members access to their personnel files. Unless express exceptions are made, such contracts would provide access to letters from graduate school mentors that were assembled at the time of initial appointment, to letters from external referees solicited on such occasions as promotion, and perhaps even to records of how particular members of faculty reviewing committees voted on such matters. Many persons question, rightly or wrongly, the credibility of letters from persons who have not been given, or cannot be given, assurance that their letters will be treated as confidential communications. There is also the danger that, in the absence of assurance of confidentiality, much communication that now takes written form will assume verbal form only, to the detriment of all parties.

Suggestion 17: Those committed to faculty governance of the institution should try to see that the union faithfully represents the interests of all the faculty and is not dominated by special interest faculty groups, e.g., tenured or non-tenured faculty, faculty in the sciences or in the humanities.

Comment: The Committee's research suggests that unions are faithfully representing the general interest of the faculty, and that

faculty members feel that they have adequate impact on union deliberations. No doubt such representation is secured by active union membership on the part of many faculty members. So that this commendable record will be perpetuated, faculty members should budget their time to allow for union activity. In particular, it seems that faculty members will at their peril adopt the same attitude of indifference toward their unions that many have taken toward their faculty senates or comparable governing bodies.

It is especially important that leadership positions in the union be held by effective and responsible persons who enjoy the confidence of the entire faculty.

Suggestion 18: Provisions of the contract should protect the traditional right of the faculty to be involved in, or to control, decisions regarding hiring, retention, promotion, tenure, and meritocratic allocation of rewards for instructional and scholarly activities.

Suggestion 19: Provisions of the contract should protect the traditional rights of faculty members (either as individuals, as members of departments, or as members of the faculty as a whole) to determine educational policies of the institution.

Comment: The faculty, not the administration, should control decisions regarding approval of new courses, the prerequisites for existing courses, the nature of the grading system, textbook selection, course content, structure of programs, etc.

Suggestion 20: Neither faculty groups nor administrations should gerrymander the proposed composition of the bargaining unit solely to increase the chances of victory during labor elections. In the event that collective bargaining is adopted in such circumstances, the lack of genuine community of interest in the bargaining unit will impede healthy negotiations, contribute to disaffection and alienation, and work against the good of the institution.

Comment: Administrations that fear collective bargaining often try to secure a ruling on the composition of the bargaining unit which they think will contribute to a "no agent" vote, with little regard for the consequences that such a unit will have on collective bargaining in the event a bargaining agent is adopted. Similarly, faculty seeking a union often try to include in the unit persons whose interests are quite different from those of regular faculty members when they think the inclusion of such persons will contribute to a union vote. Both parties should look beyond the immediacies of election and in good faith propose bargaining units characterized by deep and abiding community of interests. Both parties should recognize that the problems of negotiating are only compounded when the community of interest of the bargaining unit is spurious.

Suggestion 21: Once an institution has been unionized, the administration will feel itself to be bound only by the provisions of the contract itself. Thus it is supremely important to include in the contract a clause stipulating that the past practices of the institution will be followed in every case where the contract itself does not explicitly specify a regulation or procedure.

IV. UNIONIZATION, COLLECTIVE BARGAINING, AND LEARNED SOCIETIES

A. Other Learned Societies

Part (d) of the charge to the Ad Hoc Committee on Unionization and Collective Bargaining mandates it to "cooperate with other professional associations which have already concerned themselves with these matters." In line with this part of the charge, Professor Norman S. Care of the Ad Hoc Committee's Planning and Drafting Team contacted ten other learned societies concerning their activities relevant to collective bargaining and unionization, namely: the American Psychological Association, the American Chemical Society, The American Philological Association, The American Physical Society, the American Historical Association, The American Political Science Association, the American Economic Association, the Modern Language Association of America, The American Sociological Association, and the Mathematical Association of America. This investigation revealed that as of May 1975 none of the ten societies had engaged in any significant activity paralleling ours concerning faculty unionization. From this finding, and the following passage from a letter of February 12, 1975, to Professor Care from Tom J. Truss, Jr., Associate Secretary of the American Association of University Professors, it appears that the efforts of the APA may be pioneering ones:

> I know of no learned society which has created a committee like yours to study the implications of collective bargaining with a possible view to developing information and recommendations for its membership. It may be that the American Philosophical Association is the first one to move in this direction.

Five of the ten learned societies contacted expressed serious interest in being made aware of the results of our investigation.

Although the APA appears to be the first learned society to tackle directly the issues of faculty unions and collective bargaining, the following two items of information may be of interest. A letter received from the American Historical Association contains these lines: "The AHA has never undertaken a study of collective bargaining and unionization on college and university campuses. At the 1972 Annual Meeting, the business meeting adopted a resolution in support of collective bargaining, but it was defeated on a mail ballot." The Modern Language Association of America has not mounted an effort like ours, but its Commission on the Status of Women in the Profession has prepared a pamphlet titled "Unladylike and Unprofessional" which concerns the experiences of academic women in unions; and the MLA also recommends their pamphlet "Academic Women, Sex Discrimination, and the Law" as relevant to the subject.

B. The Bloland Report

In a report titled Learned Societies in Transition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974) (esp. pp. 108-114), prepared for the Carnegie Commission

on Higher Education by Harold G. Bloland and Sue H. Bloland, a number of points are made concerning the impact upon learned societies generally of growing interest in faculty unions on campuses. After reflection, the Ad Hoc Committee finds the Blolands' line of thought suspect. (See Appendix D for a series of excerpts from the Blolands' Learned Societies in Transition.) The view of the Blolands is that there is a danger that the trend towards faculty unionization, together with the current adverse economic situation, will bring about a decrease in and a change in character of the membership of learned societies. In the APA, for example, these predicted changes would involve a loss of membership among young Ph.D.'s and others in precarious circumstances (e.g., philosophers who cannot afford to attend APA meetings and who in any case find more relevant economic protection in local unions); and they would also result in an APA membership composed primarily of the elite and scholarly, with a fringe group of short-term members attempting to take advantage of the perhaps increasingly constricted placement services offered by the Association.

As mentioned, the Ad Hoc Committee is critical of the Blolands' speculations. We see no incompatibility between membership in a union on a college or university campus and membership in a national learned society such as the APA. Further, we see no conflict between the scholarly and professional values associated with learned societies and the economic, academic, and governance aims pursued by unions on local campuses. In fact, our studies of ten campuses which have adopted unionization show no conscious decrease in interest in or identification with the APA among unionized philosophers. (See Section II of this report, and Appendix A.) If the Blolands' point is that unionization is a threat to learned societies, then our comment is, first, that this surely need not be the case, and, second, that our evidence indicates that, in fact, it is not the case.

Beyond this negative comment we wish to point out that unions and learned societies can be mutually reinforcing. On the one side, a reasonable aim of collective bargaining for faculty is support for attending professional meetings, as well as general working conditions in which research and professional activities can flourish. On the other side, the APA itself can conduct studies and activities which can be of direct benefit to members of unions on college and university campuses. (In this connection see, e.g., (3), (4), and (9) among the recommendations made in subsection C below.)

But however misleading it may be to single out unionization as somehow a threat to a learned society such as the APA, we can all recognize that the current adverse economic situation is a genuine difficulty for philosophers, and one that might very well have an impact on the membership and character of the APA. Apart from whether or not the members of a college or university faculty elect to respond to difficult economic circumstances by unionizing, those circumstances will be reflected in attempted

retrenchment, perhaps cuts in staff, increased work loads, and reductions of professional support and benefits. The upshot is a diminished capacity among philosophers to be able to support and participate in the programs and activities of their professional society. Reduced membership, and perhaps even "elitism" in membership, may well be the result of adverse economic straits, if not of unionization *per se*.

C. Recommendations

In an awareness of the current difficult economic situation, the Ad Hoc Committee now proceeds to make certain recommendations to the Board of Officers of the APA. We assume that the APA wishes to retain its character as a disciplinary organization of value to a broad membership of philosophers, regardless of their employment status. The general aim that our recommendations serve is that of forestalling or reversing any undesirable alterations in the size or character of its membership that the APA may suffer as a result of the current adverse economic situation. And, given our discussion in B above, it should be clear that our recommendations are not made with only unionized campuses in mind. Some of the following recommendations may not seem directly relevant to the issues of unionization and collective bargaining on campus considered narrowly and for their own sake. But we believe all the recommendations are relevant to how the APA, from its standpoint as a professional disciplinary society, should respond to the variety of economic difficulties with which philosophers today must cope.

The Ad Hoc Committee recommends to the Board of Officers of the APA:

(1) That the APA's Committee on the Status and Future of the Profession be charged to inform itself of developments in collective bargaining as they relate to philosophers, and to advise the APA from time to time of areas of potential action.

(2) That, in order to facilitate informed decisions concerning the advisability of collective bargaining in general, and concerning the Ad Hoc Committee's recommendation in Section V of this Report in particular: (a) the main text of the Report (the Report without the appendixes) be sent free of charge to all members of the APA, (b) the entire Report (the main text and the appendixes) be sent free of charge to all departments and programs of philosophy in the U.S.A., and (c) the appendixes be sent free of charge to any member of the APA who requests them in writing.

(3) That a study be undertaken, the aim of which is to formulate and publish an APA Statement describing the nature of both minimal and desirable professional working conditions and compensation for philosophers, taking into account circumstances obtaining at different types of institutions.

(4) That APA members be urged to seek institutional support—through collective bargaining, where available—for professional benefits associated with teaching and research (among them: travel and *per diem* allowances for attendance at professional meetings; departmental or program supporting budgets; and budgets for library acquisitions, subscriptions to professional journals, and dues for professional societies); that the Board send letters urging such support of teaching and research to the national unions representing college and university faculty members on various campuses (By "national unions" we refer to organizations such as the AAUP, the AFT, and the NEA, which have come, through elections, to be the bargaining agents for faculty members on a number of campuses.); that the Board write to all institutions of higher education stressing the importance of attendance at professional meetings, and urging that funds for travel and *per diem* expenses not be cut during budgetary emergencies; and that the Board petition the American Council of Learned Societies also to urge such support in letters to the national unions and to all institutions of higher education.

(5) That younger philosophers, and those not employed in prestigious institutions, be increasingly involved in the activities of the APA through appointment to membership on its working committees.

(6) That members of the same groups be encouraged to maintain identification with philosophy as a profession through an increase in the proportion of submitted, as opposed to invited, papers at APA meetings, and through an increase in the numbers of them invited to comment on papers.

(7) That all possibilities for reducing the expense involved in attending APA meetings (e.g., by holding divisional meetings, when possible, on college campuses), and for reducing, in particular, costs borne by graduate students, be investigated.

(8) That regional and special-interest associations of philosophers be encouraged and supported by assistance from the APA wherever possible, e.g., by permitting such groups to meet without charge during regular APA conventions, and by publishing announcements of their meetings in APA Bulletins.

(9) That the APA increase its support for individuals who find themselves embroiled in problems of academic and political freedom on their campuses, and explicitly extend this support to unions which undertake the defense of such individuals.

Some comment upon recommendation (3) may be in order. The APA has issued "Statements" in the past, e.g., on the make-up of an adequate program for an undergraduate major in philosophy, and these have been found useful. The aim of the Statement we call for in (3) is to demonstrate the concern of the APA for the professional status and circumstances of its members (both those unionized and those not unionized), and to strengthen the position of those individuals attempting to achieve acceptable working conditions in institutions unfamiliar with, or unsympathetic toward, the requirements of professional philosophy. Doubtless the study we call for will be difficult to carry out. It would have to be prepared in such a way as to avoid certain political risks, e.g., that the standards formulated in it be used by administrators to weaken the fortunate position of philosophers whose conditions exceed them. But the thought of the Ad Hoc Committee is that such a Statement concerning professional working conditions of philosophers, prepared by their disciplinary society, would be of great value to those (most of the membership, we think) fighting retrenchment efforts, staff cut-backs, and other regressive economic measures around the country. If other learned societies were to follow the APA's lead in this matter, we think the position of academicians in general would be improved.

V. RECOMMENDED STANCE OF THE AMERICAN PHILOSOPHICAL ASSOCIATION TOWARD FACULTY UNIONIZATION AND COLLECTIVE BARGAINING IN INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER LEARNING

A. Appropriateness of an APA Stance on Faculty Unionization

Part (c) of the charge given to the Ad Hoc Committee by the Board of Officers of the APA directed it to "make appropriate recommendations to the Board of Officers and the [three] Divisions [of the APA] regarding the Association's role with respect to unionization and collective bargaining." Some of the recommendations made in Section IV, notably (1)-(4) and (9), represent part of the Ad Hoc Committee's response to this charge; the resolution proposed in this section constitutes the remainder of the Ad Hoc Committee's response to charge (c).

In view of the Board of Officers' charge, there can be no question of the appropriateness of the Ad Hoc Committee's recommending an official APA resolution dealing with unionization. But anticipating that some members of the APA will deem it inappropriate for a learned society such as the APA to take a public stance on the issue of faculty unionization, the Ad Hoc Committee wishes to call their attention to Article II, Purpose, of the Constitution of the APA. Section 1 of this article states:

> "The purpose of the American Philosophical Association shall be to promote the exchange of ideas among philosophers, to encourage creative and scholarly activity in philosophy, and to facilitate the professional work of teachers of philosophy."

The pivotal question about faculty unions, the one presently being debated on campuses across the country, is whether they facilitate or impede the professional work of college and university teachers. Thus the relevance of this question to the purpose of the APA, as given in Article II of the Constitution of the APA, is evident. Equally evident, then, is the appropriateness of the APA's taking a reasoned and informed stand on faculty unionization.

B. Recommended Stance of the APA toward Faculty Unionization

Because it is widely mooted that there is an inherent conflict between unionization and the professional status of faculty members, the Ad Hoc Committee urges the American Philosophical Association to adopt the following resolution:

The American Philosophical Association sees no inherent conflict between the professional status of faculty members and unionization. On the contrary, the American Philosophical Association recognizes that:

(a) In some circumstances unionization may be the only practical way to secure and/or enhance educational objectives and values, scholarly values, professional working conditions, adequate compensation, fair personnel practices and policies, and faculty governance. In such circumstances, the American Philosophical Association encourages unionization.

(b) In other circumstances unionization may be the most effective, or among the most effective, of the available alternatives to achieve the abovementioned ends. In these circumstances the American Philosophical Association welcomes unionization.

(c) In still other circumstances unionization may be less effective or less desirable than other alternatives for achieving these ends.

The American Philosophical Association does not regard unionization as a panacea for all the problems and ills that beset faculty members and higher education. Like every other mechanism for achieving the abovementioned ends, unionization has its own problems and drawbacks many of which are discussed in the Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Unionization and Collective Bargaining.

MINORITY REPORT AND PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS

The material that follows is not part of the Ad Hoc Committee's report and so does not carry the approval of the Committee. Rather, it represents the personal views of those individuals under whose name it appears. It includes a minority report submitted by Professor Fisk who cast the lone vote to reject the Committee's report. In addition, it includes a personal observation prepared by Professor Schacht, and a personal observation submitted jointly by Professors Gibson, Rorty, and Scanlon. For the sake of balance and completeness, this material has been placed at the end of the Committee's report rather than inserted among the appendixes where it would be less likely to be read.

MINORITY REPORT

Milton Fisk

When industrial unionism became inevitable in the '30's, the captains of industry attempted to co-opt it to their own ends. Academic unionism seems inevitable now and those who are opposed to its thrust are about the business of co-opting it. The Ad Hoc Committee's report can best be read in this context.

The report springs from a dedication to those values that have proven bankrupt in providing faculty with either a voice or security. Thus the report wants a brand of unionism that preserves the old values of collegiality, confidentiality, and meritocracy. The brand of unionism advocated by the report stands no better chance of serving the interests of faculty than the old paternalism.

The report is overly concerned with the content of collective bargaining agreements. It wants all the old rights spelled out in those agreements. There is a glaring absence of concern with the question of faculty participation in unions and the effect of collective action in advancing the interests of faculty. Contractual agreements protect nothing unless faculty are united to enforce them. Administrative bodies will find this formalistic approach of the report in their interests. What better for them than to have faculty concerned about ideal retrenchment clauses when jobs are being cut without collective protest?

The report conveys nothing of the real economic crunch that faces faculty. It raises the scare that union demands may lead to job cuts. The question now and in the foreseeable future is how to prevent cuts from becoming a hemorrhage. Without unionized pressure, how can the losses be minimized? Issues like this are naturally put into the background in a report that wants unionism to be compatible with raiding elite universities for name professors.

PERSONAL OBSERVATION

Richard Schacht

While concurring with the Committee's report, I am concerned that much more attention is likely to be paid to the qualified approval of unionization and collective bargaining it gives than to the accompanying recognition of the "problems and drawbacks" involved in taking this course; and I am further of the opinion that the latter are more serious than the language of the "Recommended Stance" would seem to indicate. I do not dispute the view that there is no inherent conflict between unionization and the pursuit of the principal goals of our profession, and that in principle contracts can be written and unions organized and run in such a way that these goals are upheld and promoted. But I consider it far from certain that things actually will tend to work out this way in practice.

Indeed, I believe it to be all too likely that, on the one hand, organization will not lead to a significant enhancement of the ability of faculty to protect present advantages and at the same time to wrest new gains from outside bodies; while, on the other hand, it will lead to an increasing predominance of considerations relating to the narrower self-interests of faculty majorities over larger professional goals. Moreover, faculty unions must be recognized to have great potential powers in relation to internal faculty affairs; and the possible uses and abuses of such powers are matters to be reckoned with. Furthermore, the common consequences of making contracts the basis of the conduct of affairs—e.g., the depersonalization of relationships, the fostering of an antagonist mentality, the reduction of matters not covered to a domain in which anything goes, and the transformation of all aspects of the affected affairs into "negotiable items"—should not be taken lightly.

It must also be acknowledged that, even with the greatest devotion to professional goals on the part of a politically astute and responsible union membership and leadership, the introduction of unionization and collective bargaining into the life of colleges and universities is likely to have a profound and far-reaching impact upon the character of that life. For unions and contracts are structures which complicate as well as facilitate, and constrain as well as protect. And adding complex machinery already encumbering modern academic life will have significant practical consequences, which ought not be overlooked or underestimated.

There undoubtedly are—and will come to be—colleges and universities where circumstances are such that, all things (including those mentioned here) considered, unionization and collective bargaining are called for. But it seems to me that in attempting to determine whether this is so in particular cases or generally, one should consider with care what both

the likely and the possible consequences of going this route are and might be—and not merely what it may in principle be possible to achieve and to guard against. And I believe that, if the matter is considered in this light, both the inevitable drawbacks and the potential pitfalls of taking this course will be seen to be sufficiently serious to warrant the conclusion, in many if not most cases, that it is definitely "less desirable than other alternatives" for achieving the legitimate ends indicated in Section V:B of the report.

PERSONAL OBSERVATION

Mary Gibson
Amelia Rorty
Thomas Scanlon

We are in general agreement with the substance of the report. It seems to us, however, that in places the report takes on a tone of warning, perhaps unintended by the drafters, and gives inappropriate emphasis to what are seen as possible side effects and harmful consequences of unionization. This is particularly true in Section III of the report, entitled "Suggestions for Making Unionization More Effective." It seems to us that some of the items in this section, while they do deal with factors an awareness of which may be helpful in making unions more effective, are presented in such a way as to make them sound like reasons not to unionize at all. Suggestion 2, for example, calls upon faculty members to "weigh the expected economic advantages to them from unionization against the disadvantages unionization may entail for other persons, such as students, non-academic staff, unemployed philosophers and new Ph.D's...". The comment on this suggestion and the following suggestion go on to warn that salary increases are likely to be financed through retrenchment in academic or non-academic employment, cutbacks in supporting services, and substantial tuition increases. It is also said that "economic gains may lead to ... pressure for greater 'productivity', which may be interpreted quantitatively...". With respect to the last threat, the report does mention that unions may also be effective in opposing these pressures and Suggestion 4 mentions that unions could help to enlarge the academic pie by lobbying or helping in fund raising. But the overall tone of this discussion is clearly negative, and it seems to be addressed more to the question "Is unionization a good thing to get into at this point?" than to the question of how unions may be made more effective. This focus is indicated, for example, in the remark (in the comment on Suggestion 2) that "Finally, one should not overlook the fact that unionization adds the not-inconsiderable expenses of collective bargaining to the customary costs of operating an institution of higher learning." (We wonder whether these expenses need be considerable in relation to the customary costs in question. At any rate, the remark seems inappropriate to this section and needs to be given some support in the committee's research.)

We would make several comments on this part of the report. (1) The threats of retrenchment, cutbacks in service, tuition hikes and increased work loads are facts of life that are and will be with us, unions or no unions. (2) One of the strongest things to be said in favor of unionization under present circumstances is that unions are virtually the only practical means for faculty members to fight against these threats, not only through such measures as lobbying and fund raising but also through the collective bargaining process itself. (3) Parts of the report seem to assume that faculty unions,

where they exist, will pursue, without restraint the interests of employed academics and will construe these interests in narrowly economic terms. As the report elsewhere recognizes, however, this need not be the case, and whether it is or not depends on how the power of a union is used. Indeed, Suggestions 2 and 3 seem most appropriate to the charge of "making unions more effective" if they are read as counselling faculty to use this power with foresight and compassion.

We have a more specific remark concerning the statistics employed in the comment on Suggestion 2. The most that these statistics would provide evidence for is the claim that during the past two years unions in the states mentioned were not successful in gaining high levels of expenditure on education (or high percentage increases) in their states as compared with other states. A number of these states, New Jersey in particular, have historically had a low level of commitment to public higher education and, in the case of New Jersey at least, a low level of expenditure on social programs in general. The figures support the view that even with unionization it is hard to get much money out of such states. To draw any more specific conclusions about the effects of unionization one would need to look specifically at the years surrounding unionization in the states in question.

Finally, the issue of "collegiality" and the "polarizing" effect of unionization is mentioned a number of times in the report. In the comment following Suggestion 13 it is mentioned positively that "there is little doubt that unionization has brought about shared authority (and in some cases collegiality) in many institutions where previously the faculty was voiceless and powerless, notably in two-year colleges and community colleges. Moreover, the lack of an effective voice in institutional governance seems to have been a principal stimulus to unionization...". Earlier, however, the report warns against the effects of an adversary relationship and points out that "at least half of those surveyed reported polarization between faculty and administration." We believe that the issues mentioned in Suggestion 13 are of more substance and relevance than the ideal of collegiality. Whatever atmosphere may prevail, it seems to us to be rare for faculty, without union support, to have much voice in such matters as salary policy, hiring and retrenchment matters over which "polarization" is most likely to occur. This opinion receives some support from the questionnaire results. While 42% report a deterioration in "faculty-administration relationships" after unionization, over 75% believe that faculty control over educational policies and budgetary priorities has either increased or remained the same. The sentiment of collegiality seems to have been compatible with a low level of faculty participation in decision making, and in some cases to have glossed over its absence.

APPENDIX A

REPORTS OF THE RESEARCH TEAMS ON 10 TARGET INSTITUTIONS

How to read this appendix.

This appendix contains a Questionnaire for Research Teams followed by ten reports of these teams which deal with the ten institutions selected for special study.

Because the Research Team reports are keyed to the Questionnaire, the reader must refer back to the Questionnaire in order to understand the import of an item in a Research Team report. For example, F(5) of the report on Temple University reads thus

F(5): It has had no effect.

To grasp the significance of this item, one must refer to question F(5) of the Questionnaire, namely:

F(5): How has it (unionization) affected retrenchment policies or plans? Rank or tenure quotas?

Thus the Temple report indicates that unionization has had no effect on retrenchment policies or plans, or on rank and tenure quotas, at Temple University.

Some of the items found in the Research Team reports will be independently intelligible, i.e., no cross-reference to the Questionnaire is needed to grasp their meaning. In many instances, however, the above-illustrated way of interpreting the Research Team reports must be employed.

Questionnaire for Research Teams

A. Identification

Give the name, faculty size, student-body size, and type (2-year, 4-year, etc.; private, public) of your institution, and of your philosophy department.

B. Background information

(1) When did your institution adopt unionization? What approximately was the vote for and against it?
(2) Which groups sought to represent the faculty? Which agent was chosen, and why?
(3) How long was the period between the adoption of unionization and the obtaining of a contract? Did this interim period work any hardships upon the philosophy faculty? If so, were they ameliorated by provisions of the contract?
(4) What is the composition of the bargaining unit? (Be specific about part-time faculty, branch campus faculty, TAs, professional school faculty, non-teaching professionals such as librarians and counsellors, department heads, administrators, etc.) Has this composition proved favorable or unfavorable to philosophy? Explain.
(5) What issues led to or precipitated unionization?
(6) Characterize, if possible, the union activists, the anti-union activists.
(7) How active were philosophers in the process? On which side of which issues?
(8) Where did the union movement derive most of its support?
(9) What was the attitude of the administration toward unionization? How did that attitude affect the character of the first contract?
(10) Is philosophy faculty support of the union greater, the same, or less now than at the time unionization was adopted?

C. Union Activity

(1) What percentage of faculty belong to the union? What percentage of the philosophers belong to the union? Does union membership of philosophers correspond to any obvious division such as that between tenured and non-tenured?
(2) Do the philosophers generally feel that their interests are being well looked after by the union?
(3) How much of the philosophers' time and energy are absorbed by union-related activities? Is there a corresponding diminution of effort elsewhere, e.g., on college committees?
(4) Do the philosophers have ready access to the union contract?
(5) Is the bargaining process largely under the control of the academic faculty?
(6) Would you describe the present contract as highly sensitive to academic concerns and objectives?

(7) Has there been any shift of identification or allegiance of philosophers away from the philosophy department and toward the union?
(8) Do you think unionization has already, or will likely, diminish the interest of the philosophers in learned societies such as the APA?
(9) Do students have any input into, or influence over, the bargaining process?
(10) Do the philosophers feel that they have adequate input into the bargaining process?

D. Teaching and Research

(1) Has unionization affected the number of independent study "courses" offered by philosophers?
(2) Has it affected the size of philosophy classes? The range of philosophy offerings?
(3) Has it affected the availability of philosophy faculty for academic advising and similar interaction with students?
(4) Has it had any other noticeable effects on faculty-student relations so far as philosophers are concerned?
(5) How has it affected teaching loads of philosophers?
(6) Has it led to "quantization" of teaching and other academic duties?
(7) How has it facilitated or impeded scholarship and research? (E.g., any new provisions for travel grants, research support funds, sabbatical leaves, etc.)

E. Governance

(1) How has unionization affected the academic senate or similar governing bodies?
(2) Has it made for more or less flexibility in curricular change and innovation?
(3) Has it increased or decreased faculty influence over educational policy?
(4) How has it affected the selection and role of the head of the philosophy department?
(5) Has it given the faculty more or less influence over appointment of high-ranking administrative officers?
(6) Has it affected the role of students in institutional governance? In governance of the philosophy department?
(7) How has it affected mechanisms for faculty grievance? For student grievances?
(8) Has there been any "polarization" of faculty and administration effected by unionization?
(9) Has it exacerbated or diminished conflicts of groups within the philosophy department?

F. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

(1) Describe how unionization has affected the appointment, promotion, and tenure policies and procedures within the department of philosophy.

(2) Has it made reappointment, promotion, or tenure easier to obtain? Explain.
(3) Has it made special provisions for affirmative action objectives?
(4) How have the formerly confidential aspects of reappointment, promotion, and tenure processes been affected?
(5) How has it affected retrenchment policies or plans? Rank or tenure quotas?
(6) How has it affected appointment, promotion, or tenure of part-time faculty?
(7) How are grievances over appointment, promotion, and tenure matters processed?

G. Economic Aspects

(1) How has unionization affected philosophy faculty salaries?
(2) What room has it left for discretionary or merit increases, as opposed to across-the-board increases? How has this worked in philosophy?
(3) Does the contract contain negotiated minimum salaries for the various academic ranks? Were there such minima or floors before? How much have they been affected by unionization?
(4) Does the contract call for cost-of-living supplements in addition to negotiated increases? Explain how they work.
(5) Does unionization seem to be tending to equalize philosophy salaries by making them strictly a function of rank and years of service? If so, how have the philosophers reacted to this aspect of unionization?
(6) How has unionization affected institutional fringe benefits?
(7) What fringe benefits (e.g., group auto insurance) does union membership bring? What is their estimated economic value?
(8) How much are union dues?
(9) How has unionization affected salaries and fringe benefits of part-time philosophy teachers?
(10) Has unionization helped or hindered philosophy faculty recruitment, both of new faculty and of more senior persons?
(11) What has it done to remedy past salary inequities in the philosophy department, e.g., in cases where a woman philosopher might have been paid less well than a comparable male colleague?

RESEARCH TEAM REPORT

California State College

A. Identification

California State College (of Pennsylvania)
Faculty size: 315. Student body size: 4900.
Type of institution: 4-year, public (state); with MA program in some departments (though not philosophy)
Size of philosophy department: 7

B. Background information

(1) Unionization was not adopted freely. There was no vote for or against it, as such. Rather, the faculty of California State College became unionized, in effect, through state law, along with the faculty at thirteen other Pennsylvania state colleges. A mandatory certification election was held in October 1971 at which the faculty chose a bargaining agent. Although there was a theoretically possible "no agent" option at the election, this was not a real option. To choose it would have been to give up all control over matters pertaining to budget and governance. That would have been especially undesirable since extensive retrenchment loomed in the future. Not being a real option, the "no agent" possibility was not seriously considered by the faculty.

(2) (a) AFT (b) AAUP, and (c) (the one finally chosen) an NEA affiliate named "the Association of Pennsylvania State College and University Faculties/Pennsylvania Association for Higher Education" (hereafter "APSCUF"). It chose APSCUF over the other two agents because APSCUF had a long (40-year) history in lobbying for the state colleges in Pennsylvania. With that background and experience it seemed likely to have more influence than either of the other agents.

(3) The period from the certification election to the signing of the first contract was about nine months. It did not work any hardships on the philosophy faculty.

(4) The bargaining unit is composed of department chairmen, full-time teaching faculty, part-time teaching faculty, and librarians (and counselors) without faculty status, employed at the fourteen Pennsylvania state colleges (incl. CSC). The composition has proved slightly favorable to philosophy in that the department chairman is included within the bargaining unit and is consequently subject to election and periodic reelection by the department.

(5) The State of Pennsylvania, confronted by frequent (illegal) strikes by public school teachers and other state employees, decided in 1971 to unionize all its employees so that they could use legitimate grievance procedures (up to binding arbitration) instead of resorting to the strike.

(6) Since CSC was not given any choice about unionization, there were no union or anti-union activists as such. However, there was an active group, based largely in the English Department, which had been long associated with APSCUF, and which campaigned vigorously for APSCUF against the other potential bargaining agents.

(7) Philosophers were not very active in the process.

(8) See (6), above.

(9) Very negative. No effect.

(10) Greater.

C. Union Activity

(1) 87%. 71%. No.

(2) Yes.

(3) Very little. No.

(4) Yes.

(5) Yes. Negotiators are elected by faculty, but impact of special interest groups might vary considerably.

(6) It is highly sensitive to some main academic concerns, especially students' rights to competent teaching and high academic standards.

(7) No.

(8) No.

(9) No.

(10) Yes.

D. Teaching and Research

(1) No.

(2) No. No.

(3) No.

(4) No.

(5) Not at all.

(6) No. (They were already "quantized" previously.)

(7) It has neither facilitated nor impeded them.

E. Governance

(1) What was largely a token advisory senate is now by-passed. Standing independent committees having representatives from each department deal directly with the administration on such matters as curriculum, tenure, etc. These committees are not restricted to union members nor are they controlled by the union. However, when problems arise in areas not well-defined by the contract (e.g., summer teaching loads), the administration meets with the union leadership in a "meet and discuss" situation.

(2) About the same. (Great flexibility both before and after.)

(3) Increased. (An increased amount of committee work by faculty is required by the union contract, but the committees carry more weight with the administration than earlier governing bodies.)

(4) The department now has a major voice in the selection of its head, whereas previously it did not. The role of the department head, though better articulated, is largely the same. One change, however, is that he has a diminished role in faculty hiring, since the whole department has an increased role (in theory, at least, inasmuch as no new philosophy faculty have been hired since unionization).

(5) Less.

(6) Yes. (They have more input, especially at the state level.) No.

(7) The opportunity for faculty grievance is greater, and the mechanism for it is much better defined. For student grievances: no effect.

(8) Yes.

(9) Neither.

F. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

(1) It has made those policies better defined and on paper somewhat more rigorous. As a matter of fact, however, there has been little change, because there have been no new Philosophy appointments under unionization (there has been a freeze on hiring) and the people who were promoted or granted tenure after unionization would probably have gotten the same under the old college-wide system (which was liberal and loose). All seven members of the philosophy department have tenure. It is difficult to determine what reappointment and tenure policies would be like had unionization not come about. With respect to philosophy, it is likely that much of the department, including some tenured members, would have been retrenched for economic reasons. It is possible that in this retrenchment atmosphere the college's overall reappointment and tenure policies would have become more rigorous. But it

is also possible (and perhaps more likely) that the old loose standards would have continued to apply to those programs that attracted great numbers of students, whereas departments like philosophy would have found reappointment and tenure increasingly difficult for economic, rather than academic, reasons. Unionization has at least provided mechanisms for improving promotion and tenure standards by establishing college-wide promotion and tenure committees. But the work of these committees is contingent upon the standards of departments, and so it may be some time before there is much improvement. (Recently, however, the tenure committee voted to deny tenure to a non-philosophy faculty member who failed to comply with the union-inspired faculty evaluation procedures.)

(2) It has made them easier to obtain than would have been the case now if unionization had not come about (see F(1)). But it has not made them easier to obtain than was the case prior to unionization (at which time they were, as now, very easy to obtain).

(3) Yes. Contract contains an article endorsing fair practices and Pennsylvania's Affirmative Action Program.

(4) Access to personnel records is generally more difficult now than before, hence there is greater confidentiality, but a faculty member has a right to receive a copy of all post-employment material placed in his or her file.

(5) What would have been inevitable retrenchment of dozens of faculty, due to declining student enrollments and budget problems, has so far been prevented by unionization (though a recent retrenchment effort mandated by the Pennsylvania Department of Education is still not settled). This has been of benefit to the philosophy department, which could have lost several members had it not been for unionization. There are no rank or tenure quotas at present; unionization probably prevented them.

(6) There are only two part-time faculty members at CSC. Their status is no doubt more secure than would have been the case without unionization.

(7) There is a possible four-step process: 1. informal grievance at the lowest management level; 2. written grievance submitted to the president of the college; 3. written appeal to the Pennsylvania Secretary of Education; 4. binding arbitration.

G. Economic Aspects

(1) It has been of overall benefit to faculty salaries. In the AAUP annual report on the economic status of the profession for 1969-70, California State College was given the following ratings, by ranks, in average scale of compensation: Professor, C; Associate Professor, B; Assistant Professor, B; Instructor, A (June 1970 AAUP Bulletin, p. 227). In the annual report for

1973-74, the ratings by ranks were: Professor, 2 (= B); Associate Professor, 1 (= A); Assistant Professor, 1 (= A); Instructor, 1 (= A) (June 1974 AAUP Bulletin, p. 220). This shows an improvement in every rank except Instructor, which was already high before unionization.

(2) Under the first contract there was a merit system whereby a college-wide faculty committee recommended discretionary increases. One philosopher was awarded one. In the second contract, merit increases have been abandoned, and in place of them will be offered "distinguished professor awards," up to a maximum of $6,000, for excellence in one's professional work.

(3) Yes. Yes. No effect.

(4) No.

(5) They were already a function of rank and years of service prior to unionization. There has been no essential change in this respect.

(6) It has provided free life insurance and free medical insurance. There is also the optional TIAA retirement plan, in addition to the state retirement program.

(7) Dental insurance benefits (value, about $100), also liability insurance (value hard to estimate).

(8) 1% of annual salary.

(9) There are no part-time philosophy teachers.

(10) In both, neither helped nor hindered.

(11) Nothing.

Research Team

Theodore Drange
Ronald Hoy

RESEARCH TEAM REPORT

Centralia College

A. Identification

Centralia College, Centralia, Washington
Faculty size: 65. Student body size: 1400.
Type of institution: 2-year public institution.

B. Background information

(1) Unionization was adopted in 1966 by a vote of the faculty, 55 for and 2 against.

(2) No other organization was active at the time and thus there was no opposition. The agent chosen was the Centralia College Education Association, affiliated with the Washington Education Association and the National Education Association.

(3) The period between unionization and the adoption of a master contract was eight years. Negotiations toward a contract did not begin until two and a half years prior to its ratification.

(4) All academic employees, that is, teachers, counsellors, librarians, division and department heads were included, as well as part-time teachers. Administrators were excluded.

(5) The issues leading to unionization revolved around conflicts between faculty and administration and the Board of Trustees. It was principally a matter of governance and salary adjustments.

(6) There was no discernible differences between activists and non-activists in the events leading up to ratification.

(7) --

(8) The union derived its support from the general body of the faculty and no differences were apparent between divisions or on the basis of age and sex.

(9) The administration and the Board of Trustees were opposed to the union and the signing of the contract until December 1973. This attitude, however, does not seem to have affected the provisions of the contract to any degree. This observation is based on the comparison of this contract with other contracts where the initial attitude towards the union was more liberal.

(10) Philosophy faculty support of the union and contract is still the same as it was in the beginning.

C. Union activity:

(1) Approximately 92% of the faculty belong to the union. The philosophy department consists of only one member and he is a member of the union.

(2) Yes; the philosophy faculty is satisfied that the interests of the department are being served.

(3) Not much time is spent by the philosophy teacher on union-related activities. There has been no diminution of attendance on other committees.

(4) Yes; philosophical faculty has ready access to the union contract.

(5) Yes; the bargaining process is under the control of the academic employees, as defined by law.

(6) --

(7) No; there has been no deviation of the philosophical faculty from the department toward the union.

(8) No; there has been no diminution of the interest of the philosophy faculty in learned societies such as the APA.

(9) Students do not make any contribution nor do they have any influence upon the bargaining process.

(10) Yes; the philosophy faculty is convinced that it has adequate opportunities for contributing to the union and the bargaining process.

D. Teaching and Research

(1) Unionization has had no effect upon the number of independent study courses offered by the philosophy department.

(2) Neither the size of philosophy classes nor the range of course offerings has been affected by unionization.

(3) & (4) There has been no effect whatever upon the interaction of the philosophy faculty and their students, neither has there been any effect upon faculty-student relations.

(5) The teaching loads of the philosophy faculty have neither increased nor decreased as a result of unionization. What changes there have been have resulted from changes in enrollment.

(6) No; however, the contract was, in part, a reaction to local and state-level "quantization" of teaching and other academic duties.

(7) Pressure from the union has had the effect of broadening the provisions of the sabbatical program, but travel grants have not changed.

E. Governance

(1) Previous to the adoption of the contract a Faculty Senate was organized which gave some impetus to the negotiation proceedings. The Senate no longer exists.

(2) There has been no discernible change in curriculum policies.

(3) Unionization has had the effect of increasing slightly the influence of the faculty on educational policy.

(4) Since there is only one member of the department there has obviously been no change here.

(5) The existence of the C.C.E.A. and negotiations provided the push needed for the Personnel Selection Policy which includes faculty in the screening and selection committee. Included in the task of this committee is the screening of candidates for administrative positions.

(6) The role of the students in institutional governance has not been affected.

(7) Before the contract there were no grievance procedures; now there is a committee which can proceed to final and binding arbitration. However, there is no such procedures for students.

(8) "Polarization" of faculty and administration has been evident. This was what led to the negotiations for the contract in the first place.

(9) Obviously, no such conflict in the philosophy department exists.

F. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure:

(1) Unionization has had no effect upon the promotion, tenure policies and procedures within the philosophy department.

(2) No change in the ease or speed with which reappointment, promotion or tenure is obtained. This is an area highly regulated by law.

(3) No; unionization has made no special provision for affirmative action policies, except a non-discriminatory clause.

(4) There has been no change in the confidential nature of the above policies and processes.

(5) There is now a retrenchment procedure in the contract (reduction in force). Previously, there was no such policy. There has been no change in rank or tenure policies.

(6) Part-time faculty have not been affected in these areas of promotion and tenure.

(7) Grievances over appointment, promotion and tenure are processed through legal channels, not via the grievance procedure of the contract.

G. Economic aspects

(1) One can only say that unionization has kept salaries at a favorable level, although, here, it has had little effect on raises.

(2) There has never been a policy or procedures here for discretionary or merit raises; therefore, there is no change.

(3) Yes; the contract negotiated minimum salaries for education and experience. However, these existed before unionization.

(4) The contract does not call for cost-of-living supplements.

(5) Unionization has not had any more effect upon philosophy faculty salaries than upon the salaries of other departments.

(6) Unionization has tended to increase fringe benefits slightly, such as insurance premiums.

(7) These would include liability, group auto and other insurance rates, group purchase rates on other items including travel. (Liability is $300,000 and costs about $3 per year per member.) Legal service for W.E.A./N.E.A. also provides for individuals and groups. There is no way one can put a monetary value on this since it differs so much from individual to individual.

(8) Union dues are $128 per year, including local, state and national dues.

(9) There is one part-time philosophy teacher here who teaches a class in the night school program. His salary has been increased, partly due to union pressure.

(10) No recruitment of philosophy faculty has been undertaken so unionization has had no effect.

(11) There has never been a problem of salary inequities at this college.

Research Team

Steven Davis
Arthur Lord

RESEARCH TEAM REPORT

Central Michigan University

A. Identification

Central Michigan University.
Faculty size: 600. Student body size: 15,000.
Type of institution: 4-year public university.
Size of Philosophy faculty: 5.

B. Background information

(1) 1969. 239 - 221.

(2) Michigan Association of Higher Education, an affiliate of NEA. No other group sought to be on the ballot. The local AAUP chapter was not interested in becoming a bargaining agent.

(3) 7 months. No.

(4) All regular (tenure system) faculty, professional librarians, coaches, counselors and chairpersons who are at least 1/2 time. No effects on department of philosophy.

(5) a) Alleged arbitrary actions of administration and Board of Trustees led to investigation by State Senate on charges of "anti-democracy." This was about 2-1/2 years prior to unionization.
b) Concern for "faculty rights."
c) CMU lowest paid four-year institution in the state.
d) New administration at time of election.

It was reported that a) and b) supplied the impetus to organization, c) and d) were factors at the time of the election.

(6) Pro-union activists: The Sociology Department seemed to be the center of activity; also involved were faculty from Education and the Arts and Sciences College. More opinionated characterizations were: a) from an active union supporter—they have moral integrity and dedication, but are politically inept and without moxey; b) from a union opponent—people with nothing else to do, without scholarly ambition.

Anti-union activists: there was no organized opposition.

(7) Two philosophers out of 6 were active, especially concerned about faculty rights and salary.

(8) See B(6).

(9) The administration was against the union.

(10) Greater; 3 of 5 currently support union compared with 2 of 6 in initial year.

C. Union Activity

(1) a) ? b) 60% c) No

(2) Three answered 'Yes'. Two answered 'No'.

(3) a) One member currently spends much time. b) No.

(4) Yes.

(5) The negotiating team is composed of faculty members of the Faculty Association, with an NEA professional as a non-voting, resource person. Two philosophers said this arrangement put the bargaining process in the hands of the minority of the CMU faculty who belong to the Association and that the Association does not represent the CMU faculty.

(6) One philosopher - Yes. One philosopher - Adequate.
Two philosophers - No. One philosopher - No answer.

(7) No.

(8) No.

(9) No.

(10) 3 - Yes. 2 - No.

D. Teaching and Research

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) No.

(4) No.

(5) No.

(6) No.

(7) No.

E. Governance

(1) Comment of the philosophers on this point was mixed. It was agreed that collective bargaining has diminished the jurisdiction of the Senate. Some thought that collective bargaining undermined the Senate in an undesirable way. Others believed there were undesirable conflicts in jurisdiction and duplication of procedures. Some also asserted that collective bargaining had strengthened the Senate.

(2) No.

(3) It has indirectly increased faculty control by increasing awareness and use of faculty review procedures.

(4) The contract recognizes the existence of procedure adopted democratically by the department for the selection and review of the chairperson.

(5) No.

(6) No.

(7) There was a grievance procedure under the Senate prior to collective bargaining. The contract established multi-level grievance procedure—with binding arbitration at final level—for contract violations. The contract also provides a supplement to grievances initiated in the Senate procedure which do not allege a contract violation, e.g., promotion and tenure. No provision for student grievances.

(8) Mixed reactions to this question. Some said 'No'. Others said that collective bargaining had sharpened administration/faculty differences and brought them out in the open.

(9) No.

F. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

(1) The contract requires that departments have procedures for appointment, reappointment, promotion and tenure. This has given added legitimacy to the philosophy department's democratic procedures.

(2) Two philosophers said 'No,' the criteria are still the same. Two others said it is somewhat easier to obtain due to the existence of grievance procedures.

(3) The contract recognizes the University's Affirmative Action Program.

(4) Under the contract faculty have the right to inspect their personnel file.

(5) The contract recognizes a procedure which provides for recall of faculty who have not been reappointed. There are no rank or tenure quotas in the contract, nor any public administration policy for same. It is believed that the contract has led to a retrenchment policy by the administration.

(6) There has been some improvement for part-time faculty who are in the tenure system. No effect on temporary, part-time faculty.

(7) Grievances over reappointment and tenure are heard by a faculty hearing committee. This is part of a grievance procedure established independent of the contract. The contract added

an opportunity for appealing a hearing committee judgment to advisory arbitration. The contract provides that individuals whose promotions were recommended but not approved may request an explanation of the reason for the denial.

G. Economic Aspects

(1) Four of five philosophers said that salaries for philosophers have increased. The union claims that CMU has moved from the lowest paid comparable institution to the fourth highest in the state.

(2) The current contract has no provision for merit increases; the previous contracts did have provision for merit increases.

(3) The contract contains minimum salaries for rank and years in rank. There were none prior to unionization.

(4) Current contract, for one year, has no cost of living supplement. The previous contract, for three years, had a "reopener clause" on economic issues if the cost of living increased 15% or more.

(5) This ambiguous question was interpreted to be asking whether philosophy salaries were equalizing with salaries for other departments. Two philosophers thought there was a tendency for this to happen although it was too soon for there to be noticeable effects. All admitted that the information needed to assess this was not available. Philosophers were favorable to this.

(6) There has been some improvement in hospitalization.

(7) Union membership entitles one to life insurance and some other benefits.

(8) $150/year. Until the current contract, CMU had an "open shop." The current contract calls for an "agency shop." This has led to a decertification move. One of the members of the philosophy department is a leader of this movement. The complaints about the contract are:
a) agency shop.
b) compensation package: salaries in excess of $16,000 were increased only $200 if they already met the minimum for years and rank.
c) retirement: a change in the program disadvantaged those nearing retirement.
d) hospitalization: coverage changed without faculty input.

(9) There are none.

(10) There has been no recruitment.

(11) Two philosophers said there were no inequities. Three said there were and that the contract will very likely do nothing about them. The inequities referred to were not based on race or sex, but on merit.

The report was largely prepared by Bruce Miller while the other member of the team, Joyce Pillote, was on sabbatical leave. The report is based on interviews by Miller of the five members of the Central Michigan University philosophy department. No attempt was made to contact other individuals at CMU. Interviews were held December 16, 1975.

Research Team

Bruce Miller
Joyce Pillote

RESEARCH TEAM REPORT

Herbert Lehman College, CUNY

A. Identification

Herbert H. Lehman College (of the City University of New York)
Faculty size: 770 full-time; c.350 part-time.
Student body size: c.11,500.

The City University of New York (CUNY)
Faculty size: 9,500 full-time; 5,000 part-time.
Student body size: 250,000
Type of institution: graduate center, 9 four-year colleges, 10 community colleges, and other units.

Note 1: Since the union at CUNY is university-wide and not broken up according to schools, it was difficult to get answers to the questions below precisely and exclusively for Lehman College. Many answers must take in the entire system. Therefore this research team felt that we should include the vital statistics of the entire CUNY system as useful background information.

Note 2: We gathered our information from the following persons through a series of formal interviews lasting an hour or more each (each received the questionnaire in advance):

Professor Irwin Polishook,	Vice President of the PSC and Professor of History, Lehman College
Miss Beryl Weinberg ,	Director for Staff Relations, PSC/CUNY
Mr. Arnold Cantor ,	Executive Director, PSC/CUNY
Professor Janet Messing ,	Chairwoman of Lehman Chapter of the PSC & Professor of Economics, Lehman College
Professor Bernard H. Baumrin,	Professor of Philosophy, Lehman College

In addition there were many informal talks with Lehman faculty. The answers which follow are the consensus of those interviewed unless otherwise noted.

B. Background information

(1) Unionization adopted by the entire CUNY system in election held in 1968.

a. CUNY: Full-time in 1968: 4,500
Part-time in 1968: 6,000

Full-time	for LC :	2,095	Against 656
	for UFTC:	1,680	
	Total :	3,775	656
Part-time	for LC :	731	Against 350
	for UFTC:	1,634	
		2,365	350

b. Lehman: Full-time in 1968: (NA)
Part-time in 1968: (NA)

1st year of Lehman's independent existence from Hunter College

Full-time for LC	: 132	Against 38
for UFCT:	85	
Total	: 217	38

Part-time: NA

(2) a) LC (Legislative Congress); b) UFCT

The Legislative Congress had been operative in CUNY since 1938 as an informal faculty agent. Although it had no legal status and its arrangements with the Board of Higher Education (BHE) were not formal contracts binding in law, still it had come to an informal understanding with the Board which tied full-time faculty salaries to the scales won through collective bargaining by the public schools. This arrangement was satisfactory to most full-time faculty since it brought them the advantages of collective bargaining without the accompanying contractual constraints.

In about 1966 with the expansion of CUNY and with the dramatic salary increases won by the AFT for the public schools, there was a movement in CUNY to unionize in a formal and legal way. Consequently in 1968, the LC and the UFCT filed to be placed on a unionization ballot. A first issue was the nature and composition of the bargaining unit. UFCT (part of UFT) wanted a single bargaining unit for full and part-time staff. LC wanted two distinct units since its support came from full-time faculty. The NLRB ruled that there were to be two units, one full-time faculty and one part-time. In the December 1968 election the full-time faculty voted 38% for UFCT and 47% LC, while the part-time faculty voted about 60% for UFCT and about 27% for LC. Since the full-time faculty did not have a majority for either the UFCT or the LC there was a run-off election late in December 1968 in which the LC won with about 53% of the votes cast. There was a startling difference in the votes from four-year colleges and community colleges. The four-year colleges went nearly 2 to 1 for the LC. The two-year colleges went nearly 3 to 2 for the UFCT. The UFCT, unlike the LC, was an AFL affiliate; the merged union, the Professional Staff Congress (PSC), is also.

(3) For first contract, negotiations began in January 1969 and the contract became effective in September 1969. For 2nd three-year contract, negotiations began in Spring 1972 and contract was not signed until about one year later (although retroactive). The delay in securing a contract weakened the image of the union as an effective means of bargaining. There was no significant movement among the faculty to strike. Union officials believe that faculty union's opposition to BHE's attempt to impose in Fall of 1973 a tenure quota strengthened the union's position. There was no hardship on the Philosophy faculty.

(4) Instructional staff, i.e., full-time and part-time faculty and Deans, Librarians, Counsellors, Business Managers, Registrars, Chairmen, lab technicians, non-tenurable higher education officers (i.e., middle administration employees). No appreciable difference — may favor senior faculty.

(5) Expansion of CUNY made informal arrangements too tenuous financially — need to clarify relative positions of full and part-time faculty.

(6) Impossible to say.

(7) Insignificant.

(8) Tenured full-time and formerly part-time faculty.

(9) Negative to hostile. Not much. (2nd contract delayed because of administration attitude, see above). BHE preferred LC in 1969. (Work load and money).

(10) Slightly greater support.

C. Union activity

(1) a. CUNY:

entire faculty (full and part-time)	47%
full-time faculty	63%
part-time faculty	8%

b. Lehman:

full-time faculty	58%
part-time faculty	NA

33% philosophy at Lehman.
Figure for philosophers throughout CUNY not available.

(2) Yes, with respect to financial and work load and released time. Strong reservations about working conditions.

(3) Insignificant. No.

(4) Yes.

(5) Yes, through elected representatives of colleges. All the expected political overtones at the various colleges, locally; faculty representatives, not union staff, make decisions. But the bargaining decisions are made on a highly centralized basis.

(6) No — at least only indirectly. Union believes that faculty should make academic judgments. Contract does not involve "academic judgments"; tries to assure faculty rights and procedures in making those judgments.

(7) No.

(8) No

(9) No.

(10) Subjective criteria make these perceptions on part of faculty variable. Union does represent in its demands not only real objectives to be achieved, but also wants of faculty (even if unrealistic) and problem areas (even if not solvable by this contract). (Some sentiment: questionable, probably not).

D. Teaching and Research

(1) Helped, e.g., kept down overload by defining what is excessive.

(2) Yes, helped.

(3) No.

(4) No.

(5) No change; perhaps helped keep them down.

(6) To some slight extent.

(7) Helped (some sentiment: negligible).

E. Governance

(1) No change; both faculty and administration more sensitive to each other's problems. Some union members (a minority) want to eliminate such bodies as faculty senate. (Union official believes that it protects faculty self-governing.)

(2) No substantive change; less innovation and flexibility in that it prevents unilateral decisions.

(3) Yes and no; again, less flexibility and less ability to initiate; no long-run effect due directly to unionization.

(4) No change, protects election.

(5) No change.

(6) No change; opposes formal role of students.

(7) Before contract no faculty grievance procedures; see contract Art. 20 (copy attached); no provision in contract for student grievances.

(8) Philosophy department thinks "yes"; union thinks not.

(9) No change.

F. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

(1) Not adverse; more detailed procedures.

(2) No change (some think that Administration is susceptible to grievance procedures, etc., i.e., easier to get tenure).

(3) Yes; see art. 8 of union contract.

(4) To some degree, e.g., observation reports must be shown to instructors .

(5) Opposed quotas; union has made proposals for necessary retrenchment.

(6) Introduced procedural requirements; introduced quasi-tenure status for lecturers (full-time).

(7) See contract. Some ability to pressure this administration to avoid arbitrary or unjust actions. Some go to arbitration (most lose at 1st and 2nd stage).

G. Economic aspects

(1) Very favorable.

(2) No merit changes.

(3) Yes; not for part-timers; formalized and stabilized by contract.

(4) No; union defends this change.

(5) Yes; no complaint from faculty.

(6) Yes, improved (already excellent).

(7) See contract (through NEA); but minimal real value. Have good fringes already: NEA benefits add little. Little change in CUNY benefits.

(8) Ca. $200 a year; sliding scale.

(9) Salaries are up; no fringes.

(10) Helped only through salary; hindered some by complicating procedures.

(11) Salaries are equalized by rank and service; not much about past inequities; prevents future problem to large extent; some discrimination in promoting women.

Research Team

Vincent Potter
David Rosenthal

RESEARCH TEAM REPORT

Illinois Valley Community College

(Note: Many of these answers are sketchy, incomplete or unknown, because the Team member, Richard Schacht, making out this report was unable to obtain the relevant information.)

A. Identification

Illinois Valley Community College
Faculty size: 80 full-time. c.60 part-time faculty.
Student body size: c.3,500
Type of institution: 2-year (Junior College); public.
Philosophy Department: None; philosophy is part of the Humanities Division, with no separate identity. (Philosophy classes are taught by 3 people, none of whom are primarily philosophers.)

B. Background information

(1) 1963; ?.

(2) ?; American Federation of Teachers; ?.

(3) Apparently c.one year; ?; ?.

(4) Bargaining unit consists of all full-time (no part-time) teaching faculty, with the exceptions of all those occupying administrative positions (e.g., Deans, Directors of programs, Division Chairmen, as well as non-teaching staff). Bargaining team consists of three faculty members who volunteer and then are selected by the executive council of the union.

(5) ?.

(6) ?.

(7) Not at all, since philosophy was not taught at IVCC until 1969, and since there are no faculty identifiable primarily as philosophers there even now.

(8) ?.

(9) ?.

(10) ?; (no philosophy faculty as such).

C. Union Activity

(1) All full-time teaching faculty belong (voluntarily).

(2) They seem to feel greatly burdened in a variety of ways which the union seems powerless to alter (e.g., heavy course loads, other onerous duties), but not any more than anyone else.

(3) ?.

(4) Yes.

(5) ?.

(6) Reasonably so.

(7) No philosophy department; the union is the whole regular teaching faculty, whereas faculty identification is mainly at the Division level.

(8) No.

(9) No.

(10) As individuals, yes.

D. Teaching and Research

(1) No.

(2) No; No.

(3) No.

(4) No.

(5) It has fixed them (along with everyone else's) at a high level; they are very heavy for all (minimum: 30 hours per two-semester academic year).

(6) Not in any special way.

(7) It merely codifies standard practices.

E. Governance

(1) ?.

(2) Has made little difference.

(3) A slight increase.

(4) No head or chairman (no department).

(5) No change (little influence).

(6) No; No (Humanities Division).

(7) Sets forth an extensive grievance procedure for faculty; does not pertain to students.

(8) Some, since all non-administrative teaching faculty belong while all administrative personnel are excluded from it.

(9) No philosophy department; no effect upon relations between the three individuals who teach the philosophy courses.

F. Appointments, Promotion, Tenure

(1) None (no department).

(2) No change; merely codifies prior practice.

(3) No.

(4) ?.

(5) ?.

(6) Has not affected them.

(7) They are not processed; no such grievances are provided for.

G. Economic aspects

(1) It has standardized them and other teaching salaries.

(2) None.

(3) Yes—a straight, inflexible salary schedule, pegged to degrees earned and years of service.

(4) No.

(5) Yes; ?.

(6) ?.

(7) Hospitalization and insurance—$16/month for single coverage, up $42/month for family coverage.

(8) ?.

(9) Does not apply.

(10) Does not apply.

(11) It eliminates any such inequities completely, because everyone's salary is fixed by the salary schedule, which makes salaries entirely a matter of degrees earned and years of service.

Research Team

Myrna Evans
Richard Schacht

RESEARCH TEAM REPORT

Macomb County Community College

A. Identification

Macomb County Community College, Warren, Michigan
Faculty size: 311. Student body size: 10,600 (equated full-time students).
Type of institution: 2-year public, emphasis on vocational or technical.
Size of philosophy department (called "area"): 2.

B. Background information

(1) 1967. Almost unanimously for.

(2) MEA and AFT were involved but it was decided not to affiliate with an outside group.

(3) Less than one year. No hardship on philosophy faculty.

(4) Bargaining unit consists of full-time faculty, counsellors, librarians. Excluded are administrators, part-time faculty, TA's (there are no department heads). The composition of the bargaining unit seems to have no effect on the philosophy area.

(5) a) Concern for faculty participation in the formation of academic policies.
b) Revolt against the paternal attitude of the administration.
c) Concern for faculty rights and the establishment of a grievance procedure.

(6) Most activists were from the social science and communications areas.

(7) Moderately active.

(8) Support seemed almost universal.

(9) Hostility. The first contract was a real test of strength.

(10) Faculty support remains about the same.

C. Union activity

(1) 100% of the faculty belong to the union.

(2) Yes.

(3) Very little time is spent by philosophy faculty on union activities.

(4) Yes. Every faculty member has a copy of the contract.

(5) Yes.

(6) Yes.

(7) No.

(8) No.

(9) No.

(10) Yes.

D. Teaching and Research

(1) No.

(2) Yes. Class size is determined by contract. Standard size is 28 students. Beyond that number, the teacher is paid $6.00 per semester hour ($18 per extra student). No class can exceed 35 without the permission of the teacher.

(3) No.

(4) No.

(5) Standard teaching load by contract is 14 to 16 semester hours (the same as before unionization).

(6) The administration seems to view education in quantitative terms. This attitude did not originate with unionization but unionization seems to have promoted that kind of thinking.

(7) Little effect.

E. Governance

(1) It seems to have given the senate more authority.

(2) Less flexibility.

(3) Increased faculty influence over education policy.

(4) No effect. (We have no department heads.)

(5) Perhaps it has given faculty more influence over appointment of high-ranking administrators, but it would be very hard to document.

(6) No effect.

(7) The contract sets up a grievance procedure for all bargaining unit members.

(8) There always was some polarization, but the unionization has increased it to a great extent.

(9) Not applicable.

F. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

(1) Unionization has replaced "merit" promotions with automatic progression.

(2) A two-year probation for new teachers has been established. If the teacher is retained for the third year he is automatically put on permanent contract.

(3) No.

(4) The contract establishes procedures to insure confidentiality of material in personnel files, and also permits access to one's own file for inspection.

(5) The administration is very conservative in hiring new teachers because once a teacher is on permanent contract it is very difficult to remove him.

(6) Part-time teachers are not covered by the contract, but the contract insures faculty input in the hiring of part-time teachers.

(7) We do not have a department system and no important appointive positions. Promotions are automatic by contract, as is tenure. Hence we have had no problems in these areas.

G. Economic aspects

(1) Salaries have increased dramatically since unionization. Most of this increase has been on the top end of the salary scale.

(2) There are no merit increases.

(3) The minimum-maximum salaries for 1975-76 are $10,400 to $20,750.

(4) Cost-of-living allowance is computed on the basis of Consumer's Price Index for Urban Wage Earners and Clerical Workers, published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. For each .4 change in the index there is an adjustment of $8.00 per quarterly period.

(5) Yes. Philosophers have no objections.

(6) Fringe benefits have been greatly increased.

(7) Life Insurance (twice the annual salary); Short and Long-term term disability; Accidental Death and Dismemberment; Blue Cross; Dental Insurance; Blue Shield; Professional Public Liability Insurance; Cost-of-living Allowance.

(8) 1% of the basic salary.

(9) Not applicable.

(10) No effect.

(11) No past inequities existed in the philosophy area.

Research Team

Maryellen MacGuigan
Phillip Wagand

RESEARCH TEAM REPORT

Rutgers University

A. Identification

Rutgers University
Faculty size: 1,859. Student body size: 29,653
New Brunswick (graduate: 8,680)
(undergraduate: 20,973)
Size of philosophy faculty: 34
Graduate students in philosophy: 44 (full and part-time)

B. Background information

(1) 1970: no vote; the determination was made by the outgoing President, Mason Gross, who gathered a "consent agreement" with the AAUP.

(2) The AAUP was chosen over the AFT; it was favored by President Gross as a more appropriately "professionally oriented" bargaining agent.

(3) Twenty-two months, for the first three-year contract ; no, the philosophy faculty was not particularly affected by the length of the initial negotiating period.

(4) All of the faculty, including those with half-time appointments; teaching assistants and graduate assistants; librarians; department heads; no administrators or deans, even when they hold faculty appointments. At present, no counsellors or co-adjutants, but this is under discussion. This composition has had no effect on the philosophy faculty or the philosophy program.

(5) There were feelers from the AFT; the "management wanted a company union"; Gross's movement towards the AAUP was considered a satisfactory compromise. The faculty seem to judge that the differences between the AFT and the AAUP are at present minimal, although the AFT bargainers may be more experienced. The AAUP has turned out to be tougher and better organized (locally) than most faculty predicted.

(6) Because Rutgers is divided into several campuses, each with a quite distinctive ethos, this is difficult to do. Age, department and rank differences appear to be irrelevant.

(7) Some philosophers were quite active in the unionization of the University; but for the most part, the philosophers supported unionization without actively participating either in the organizing or in organization.

(8) The support was quite diverse, though perhaps the Labor Studies Department, the Sociology Department and the Philosophy Department were most active.

(9) Initially President Gross supported the AAUP quite strongly; believed in collective bargaining. The new administration, under President Blaustein is judged by the faculty to give the AAUP and its bargaining units public support, but to undercut the bargaining in practice. The faculty regards the administration as agents of the Legislature, rather than as its representative to the Legislature. The immediate effect of this has been to increase faculty support of the AAUP, and to "unionize" what had been regarded as a professional organization.

(10) Greater.

C. Union activity

(1) A majority, about 55%

(2) Reasonably well; most of the faculty don't seem to give the matter much thought.

(3) Only one member of the department is at all active; if anything, this has increased rather than diminished her University activities.

(4) Yes, just as do the other faculty.

(5) Yes, the bargaining process is, but not the outcome. There is only one membership meeting annually. In fact, the AAUP is presently run by its executive council and the bargaining officers. The organization is judged to be responsive to faculty opinion, but the faculty have not been active, even when highly sensitive matters were at stake. At present there is a two-stage bargaining process: in principle the entire bargaining unit is surveyed, and then the Committee draws up demands. The delegate assembly, which includes non-union members of the faculty, is invited to review the demands.

(6) Sensitive in principle and organization, but not in practice.

(7) No.

(8) No; the functions are regarded as distinct.

(9) Only Teaching Assistants.

(10) In theory, yes; in practice, it would take more time than they are now willing to spend. The organization is diffuse and cumbersome.

D. Teaching and Research

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) No.

(4) No.

(5) No.

(6) The AAUP is demanding that "work-load studies," sponsored by the University at the request of the Legislature, be carried out only after negotiation with the AAUP. This is an area where the faculty feels that the President of the University is failing to represent their interests.

(7) It is too early to tell. Much of this is under negotiation and discussion.

E. Governance

(1) It is too early to tell: much of this is to be discussed and negotiated. The AAUP tried to change the composition of the academic Senate, to make it a faculty body (instead of a body heavily saturated with ex officio administrative appointments). This move failed. Now the AAUP is trying to arrange that the Senate must refer all issues involving working conditions to the AAUP for negotiation. The administration had been using the Senate to change conditions of contract—e.g., the academic calendar, teaching loads, etc.

(2) & (3) Too early to tell.

(4) Not at all.

(5) This is under discussion. At present the Provost is appointed without a faculty search committee; this is a highly sensitive and very powerful administrative position.

(6) No.

(7) It has considerably strengthened the mechanisms for faculty grievances, especially over matters of reappointment and tenure.

(8) "Polarization" is too strong. Before unionization, the University was run by a buddy system, composed of relatively paternalistic administration and their faculty cronies. If one had access to this group, it was not difficult to affect University policy; but if one was not part of the network, the organizational stream for getting consensus was virtually non-existent. There was no strong polarization of the discontented because it was a fairly benign oligarchy, and because the University was highly decentralized, and organization would have been extremely difficult.

(9) No.

F. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

(1) There is now negotiation for a joint faculty-administration committee to determine procedures for non-tenured faculty. Also under negotiation is a recomposition of the Summit

Committee (the Committee of last appeal in tenure decisions) to become one-half faculty.

(2) & (3) Yes, the AAUP bargained an inequities committee.

(4) The AAUP is negotiating to allow personal files to be opened to examination, especially for grievance cases.

(5) The AAUP is asking that the present joint committee on retrenchment—which at present is only consulted on policy matters—determine policy.

The AAUP is asking the University to commit itself to an explicit statement that there be no tenure quotas; at present there is only an informal understanding to that effect.

(6) —

(7) —

G. Economic Aspects

(1) Salaries have increased.

(2) The AAUP is arguing that there be automatic increases.

(3) Yes; yes.

(4) Not automatically assured; presently negotiated each year. Even the annual increment is annually negotiated.

(5) That seems to be the tendency. There has not yet been a strong reaction; the University still reserves considerable latitude for negotiations to make high-salaried prestige appointments.

(6) This has been affected by general unionizing activity, and took place before the AAUP was constituted our union.

(7) Summer charter flights, but not much else.

(8) Ranked by salary: for over $15,000, $84 annually of which $48 is applied to the local unit.

(9) This is under negotiation.

(10) No effect.

(11) The AAUP has strongly supported the affirmative action programs.

H. Foreseeable Problems for the Union

The AAUP does not, at present, have any marked internal conflicts of interest. But as the University's financial problems become more severe, this is likely to become a major problem. The University seems to have settled on a policy of down-grading faculty appointments to save on salary costs: many vacancies are not being

filled at all; others are being filled by teaching assistants, whose salary scale is, of course, far below that of instructors, and who do not qualify for expensive fringe benefits. Since Fellowship money is being cut back, the graduate students are vying for TA appointments. The interests of the various ranks are at odds with one another: tenured faculty vs. untenured faculty vs. TA's, with the untenured faculty being themselves torn between wanting no freeze in tenure slots and realizing that this may result in a cutback in the number of untenured slots.

The AAUP has given some thought to recommending that the TA's form their own union, on the grounds that the bargaining committee may not be able to represent them and represent the majority of the faculty, as well as on the grounds that they may get further representing their own interests to the University. But so far very few TA's have been at all active in the AAUP.

Rutgers has been, and will continue to be a difficult university to organize. There are five autonomous and geographically separate Colleges in New Brunswick, not to mention the campuses in Newark and Camden. Although the graduate faculty is composed of the faculty of the various Colleges, not every faculty member is automatically judged qualified to be a member of the graduate faculty. Since the active members of the graduate faculty have a lighter teacher load than the undergraduate faculty, this creates a certain amount of ill feeling. But the invidious comparisons cannot easily generate problems around which organizing can take place: the faculty are spread about; many commute from New York and Princeton; it is hard to track down people, and difficult for them to find time to meet.

The University itself is decentralized; it is difficult to determine the powers of various committees and administrators; and the key administrators themselves always have their difficulties with the State Legislature and the Commissioner of Higher Education to fall back upon in a chain of buck-passing.

New Jersey, which has no State Income tax, has traditionally been a very poor supporter of its University. This has been made worse by the decision to build up the State College system, and to subsidize the Community Colleges. Not only is the State reluctant to give funds to the University, but it is able to impose worse working conditions for the faculty of the State College system (longer teaching hours, a lower pay scale, fewer sabbatical benefits and research grants). Having done so, it is now prepared to attempt to impose severer restrictions on the University. It is not merely a question of saving money; it is also a question of control of major decisions about policy, about governance, about strengthening or weakening programs, graduate studies, criteria for tenure and promotion. There is every reason to

believe that there will be increased need for vigilance over autonomy. The union is alert to these problems, and is pressing for improvement. But its bargaining power is very poor; it has little leverage except the threat of a strike. There has, in fact, been a strike in the State College system; and some of the faculty demands were in principle granted. But the actual outcome in practice has been such as to discourage further striking. What was granted has not yet been received; the strikers must now take court action to actualize their gains.

Research Team

Amelie Rorty
Thomas Scanlon

RESEARCH TEAM REPORT

St. John's University

A. Identification

St. John's University, New York City
Faculty size: 418 full-time; 150 part-time
Student body size: 14,000
Type of institution: 4-year private University, with M.A. and Ph.D. programs
Size of philosophy faculty: 25

B. Background information

(1) 1969. First Agreement July 1, 1970

Vote for Unionization	
AAUP	152
*FA	155
UFCT	90
No Union	46
Challenged Votes	32

*Faculty Association at St. John's

(2) Because of the 32 challenged votes a joint bargaining agent was approved AAUP - FA

(3) Approximately one year. No.

(4) All full-time and all part-time faculty at both Jamaica and Staten Island Campuses. Law School not included. No TA's. Faculty non-teaching professionals, e.g., Librarians,are not included. Favorable.

(5) Concern over the dismissal without due process of 31 faculty members and the subsequent censure by the AAUP. Also, low salary scale and inadequate disability and retirement benefits.

(6) Union activity seemed to center in the School of Business and Modern Foreign Languages. No anti-union activity. University did not oppose unionization.

(7) Not very active, with the exception of one member of the Department.

(8) School of Business, Modern Foreign Languages.

(9) Cautious, but not opposed. They saw unionization as a way of showing good faith after the AAUP censure. Their attitude was positive and a very satisfactory contract was arrived at amicably.

(10) Philosophy faculty support is greater than before.

C. Union activity

(1) A sizable majority. The exact percentage not known. About 80% of the Philosophy faculty. No.

(2) Yes.

(3) Very little. No, except for the one member who is on the bargaining unit.

(4) Yes.

(5) Yes.

(6) The present Contract is sensitive to academic concerns in such areas as curriculum research, criteria for tenure, etc. There can be no reduction or elimination of programs without due process. There is a "memorandum of understanding" i.e., a binding agreement between the local chapter of the AAUP and FA that all contract demands must meet AAUP standards on governance (1966 AAUP Statement on Governance of Universities).

(7) No, because there is no conflict.

(8) No.

(9) No.

(10) Yes.

D. Teaching and Research

(1) No.

(2) No. No.

(3) Yes. Contract provides for academic advising and counselling with equivalent reduction of teaching load of 3 credits.

(4) No.

(5) Contract provides for a maximum of 200 students per semester. Number of teaching hours are not covered by Contract.

(6) No.

(7) Has increased availability of research leaves, with one semester at full pay and two at half, every six years.

E. Governance

(1) Structure of Senate remains the same but much of the previous business is now handled through Collective Bargaining.

(2) Union has stayed out of academic matters.

(3) In providing due-process and a chance to be heard, it has increased faculty influence.

(4) Has left it same.

(5) It has given faculty more influence, since Contract provides for selection of Deans by Faculty Search Committee.

(6) No. No.

(7) It has established a grievance mechanism for faculty but not for students.

(8) No, it has not resulted in polarization.

(9) No effect.

F. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

(1) Previous statutes were incorporated into the Contract with the addition of more stringent tenure criteria. Union does not involve itself in academic judgments but only in violation of procedure.

(2) Has protected faculty from arbitrary decisions but made the criteria for tenure stricter.

(3) No, but contract calls for faculty consultation in carrying out affirmative action plans.

(4) Faculty member is entitled to be present at meeting to present his case or to have it presented by a colleague of his choice. Discussion and voting remain confidential but he is entitled to know the outcome of the vote.

(5) It has had the effect of protecting faculty members and departments by preventing unilateral action by the Administration of C(6). Also, there are no tenure quotas.

(6) It has reduced arbitrary actions about part-time faculty.

(7) They are referred to the Grievance Committee of the Bargaining Agent.

G. Economic aspects

(1) It has improved them considerably.

(2) One Contract provided for a merit fund to be allocated by a committee of faculty, students and administrators. The new Contract has no such provision, but some modified form of it is under active consideration. Same as the rest of University.

(3) Yes. No. They have been increased.

(4) Yes.

(5) In two contracts the increase was a fixed percentage across the board and hence already wide disparities were increased. The present contract provides a graduated scale of increments which has had a slight equalizing effect. The philosophers seem to be relatively content.

(6) Unionization has significantly improved them, e.g., medical benefits, life insurance, etc.

(7) TIAA/CREF Retirement Annuity Plan (Matching funds provided by University up to 10% of Salary), Supplementary Pension Plan, Group Life Insurance (fully underwritten by the University), Blue Cross/Blue Shield (including any rise in premiums), Life Insurance for retirees, Travel Insurance and Tuition Waiver for faculty spouse and dependent children.

(8) Nationally, the AAUP has a graduated scale based on salary. The local chapter of the AAUP is $5.00; the FA is $10.00.

(9) Salaries have gone up; fringe benefits not covered.

(10) It has benefited recruitment by removing AAUP censure, by raising salaries and fringe benefits. There is no contractual upper limit on what the University may offer a newly recruited faculty member, which is most helpful in recruiting senior professors.

(11) Floor levels were established and see also G(5).

Research Team

Thomas Fay
Virginia Held

RESEARCH TEAM REPORT

Temple University

A. Identification

Temple University
Faculty size: 1,200. Student body size: 24,000
Type of institution: private, State-related institution
Size of philosophy faculty: 18 full-time members
17 permanent tenure
Graduate students in Philosophy: 68

B. Background information

(1) July 5, 1973 (final certification) vote was approximately 60% in favor of the AAUP.

(2) AAUP, AFT, NEA and No Representation were on the first ballot. AAUP was chosen in a run-off election against AFT.

(3) Approximately one year. (Salary increases were deferred and later applied retroactively.)

(4) Full-time faculty members and such non-teaching professionals as librarians. Department chairmen but not administration staff are included. Teaching assistants are not covered under the contract.

(5) The Commonwealth of Pennsylvania required all state-related institutions to provide opportunity for collective bargaining.

(6) & (7) Philosophy was conspicuous in its desire to organize for collective bargaining and divided in the run-off election with a majority favoring AAUP over AFT.

(8) NEA from the College of Education faculty, AAUP and AFT widely distributed. In the run-off election apparently many who previously voted against any representation tended to support the AAUP.

(9) The Administration indicated no preference.

(10) Original support existed in the department. It has not eroded. If anything there is probably a bit more.

C. Union activity

(1) 100%

*(2) Yes 5; uncertain 6; no 0.

*(3) None 3; very little 6; a great deal 1.

(4) Yes.

(5) Yes.

*(6) Yes 3; no 4; moderately 1; unclear 3.

*(7) No 11.

*(8) No 11.

(9) No.

*(10) Yes 5; no 5; uncertain 1.

D. Teaching and Research

(1) No.

(2) No.

(3) No.

(4) No.

(5) No.

(6) No.

(7) No.

E. Governance

(1) It is yet too early to know. The contract gives to the bargaining unit some functions previously held by the faculty Senate, e.g., grievances, affirmative action, etc., but the Senate continues to function in other important areas.

*(2) No change 9; impedes 2.

*(3) No change 8; less 2; more 1.

(4) No.

(5) No effect

(6) No.

(7) See F(7) below.

*(8) Yes 6; no 5.

*(9) Yes 1; no 9; don't know 1.

F. Appointment, Promotion, and Tenure

(1) As such the contract has not affected appointments, but because of the total economic picture new appointments are not expected to be frequent. Promotions have proceeded as before, neither

easier nor more difficult to achieve. With an almost totally tenured department, there is no visible effect on tenure.

(2) There has been no occasion to compare. It is assumed no change.

(3) Yes, the University and the AAUP are agreed to cooperate in the implementation of the Affirmative Action Program.

(4) The confidential aspects of reappointment, promotion, and tenure processes have been retained. The contract states that existing tenure practices will not be altered during the life of the present agreement.

(5) It has had no effect.

(6) Part-time appointments were eliminated for economic reasons before the contract.

(7) Grievance is presented informally to the Chairman for resolution within twenty days. Failing this, it must be presented in writing to the Chairman who will answer the grievance within five days. If the first step does not resolve the dispute, the matter is presented to the Dean within five days, who must answer it within ten days. If this second step does not resolve the dispute the grievance is presented to the Vice President of Academic Affairs for resolution within five days. If no resolution is achieved arbitration is the final and binding step. Costs of arbitration are borne equally by the University and the AAUP.

G. Economic Aspects

*(1) Improved 5; worsened 2; same 4.
Retroactive 1973-74 salaries + 6.2% of 1972-73 base.
1974-75 salaries + 5.5% of 1973-74 base.
January 1975 salaries + 2.5% of 1973-74 base.
July 1975 to January 1976 salaries + 4% of 1974-75 base.
January 1976 to June 1976 salaries + 5% of 1974-75 base.

*(2) Same 2; worse 2; terribly 4; too soon to tell 3.

1% for merit and 1% for inequities were made available. This is considerably less than discretionary merit increases in the past. Recommendations come from a departmental committee on Merit and Inequities.

(3) Yes. Over the three-year life of the contract they raise instructors' minimum by $2,500, assistant professors' by $2,000, associate professors' by $2,500 and professors' by $2,800.

(4) No.

*(5) Yes 2; no 5; don't know 4.

(6) All previous finge benefits are maintained. In addition an early retirement plan is available, higher life insurance values, including a non-contributory policy, etc. have been included.

(7) Individual fringe benefits include sick and maternity leave, disability agreements in addition to (6) above.

(8)

Salary	Dues
below 8000	$57
8000- 9999	63
10000-11999	69
12000-14999	75
15000-above	81

(9 of 11 responding pay dues.)

(9) There are no part-time teachers.

(10) Budget limits, unrelated to unionization, have determined recruitment plans.

(11) Nothing.

*Marks questions on which department members were polled. Of 18 members, 11 responded.

Research Team

John Fisher
Charles Raff

RESEARCH TEAM REPORT
University of Hawaii

A. Identification .

The system consists of two four-year institutions:
University of Hawaii at Manoa
University of Hawaii at Hilo, Hilo College

And seven two-year institutions:
Hawaii Community College
Honolulu Community College
Kapiolani Community College
Kauai Community College
Leeward Community College
Maui Community College
Windward Community College

Bargaining was done for the entire system by one agent.
All are public institutions. Only the University at Manoa has graduate work.

Faculty size: 2,527. Student body size: 41,079.

B. Background information

(1) In 1970 the Hawaii State Legislature enacted a Law ordering the University faculty to unionize.

(2) Four groups campaigned to be the bargaining agent:

Hawaii Federation of College Teachers (AFL-CIO)
College and University Professional Association (CUPA), an NEA affiliate
Hawaii Government Employees Association (HGEA)
University of Hawaii Professional Association (a combination of AAUP and Manoa Faculty)
The ballot also contained a "No Representation" option

The first ballot results were:

HFCT	-	552
UHPA	-	560
CUPA	-	460
HGEA	-	96
No. Rep.	-	287

A runoff ballot was taken with the results:

HFCT	-	995 (CUPA joined with them)
UHPA	-	805

(3) HFCT negotiated a contract which was rejected by the faculty by a vote of 5 to 1, chiefly because of non-cost items: e.g., tenure, peer review, sabbatical leaves, quotas.

In May 1973, a decertification vote was taken which ousted HFCT as the Bargaining Agent.

In October 1973, the Hawaii Public Relations Board authorized a new election for a Bargaining Agent with the results:

UHPA - 1138
HFCT - 721

In March 1975, UHPA negotiated a contract approved by 94% of the faculty.

(4) Composition: All faculty from Instructor up. Librarians, Counselling Staff, County Agents. (Department Chairpersons were in the unit, but Deans were not).
This situation has made no difference to the faculty.

(5) Required by Legislative law of 1970.

(6) When HFCT was the agent the polarization was very great between themselves and the administration with whom we had normally had collegiality, and the rest of the faculty, most of whom sympathized with either AAUP or no-representative. Now that UHPA is the agent the faculty versus faculty polarization seems to be disappearing.

(7) Philosophers were active on all sides of the issue.

(8) The first Agent, HFCT, derived its major support from the two-year colleges. The second agent, UHPA, derived its major support from the four-year colleges. On the Manoa campus the no-rep. support came chiefly from the College of Engineering.

(9) At the level of deans, with whom we had normal communication, there was opposition. Since they were not on the Bargaining Team, their opposition made no difference. Our former President opposed it, but he had been replaced before bargaining was completed.

(10) Since we have just (March 18, 1975) ratified our first contract after three years of negotiation it is too soon to answer this question.

C. Union Activity

(1) Since every full-time faculty member must pay the dues whether he/she is a union member or not, there has been little incentive to "join" the union. The only advantage that declaration of intent to join brings one is the right to hold chapter office (under UHPA), although under HFCT only members could vote.

(2) Faculty by their ratification vote of the contract are at the moment satisfied. Philosophers are not unique in their attitude.

(3) About the same amount of time has been spent in union-related activities that any faculty person on the College Senate would have to spend, i.e., if one were on a union committee it would be as time-consuming as if one were on a senate committee. Most faculty are on neither union nor senate committees, however.

(4) Every faculty person has a copy of the contract.

(5) Until recently the chief spokesman was a labor lawyer. This has been changed so that a member of the faculty is chief spokesman. The state board of the union is composed entirely of faculty.

(6) Yes, since it delegates the major curricular, promotion, tenure, and long-range academic planning to the existing Senate structure.

(7) There has been no such shift in any departments on the campus.

(8) No, there appears to be no diminution of interest on the part of faculty in any discipline and their learned societies.

(9) No, they have no role contractually. All bargaining is between faculty and administration solely.

(10) The faculty generally felt they had input in the current contract. They did not feel so with the rejected contract.

D. Teaching and Research

(1) No, it has not affected the nature or number of any courses on the campus.

(2) No, it has not affected either the size of classes, nor the range of offerings.

(3) No, it has not affected the availability of faculty in any way with respect to interaction with students.

(4) No, there have been no effects on student-faculty relations.

(5) It has not affected the teaching loads. They remain at nine semester hours per semester.

(6) No, it has not led to any more quantification than already existed under the former system of legislative reports.

(7) No change in travel. The same rights on sabbaticals that we enjoyed before.

E. Governance

(1) Very little. It has removed the Grievance Procedure from the Senate, and replaced the Senate elected Promotion and Tenure Committees by union elected committees. It is expected that

essentially the same persons will serve under the new Grievance and Promotion Committees as under the old system. Other than this the Senates retain all their old functions.

(2) The same processes remain for curricular change and innovation.

(3) The faculty have the same influence over education policy as they had before unionization.

(4) The process by which department heads are selected was untouched by unionization.

(5) There has been no change in faculty influence in the selection of top administrators.

(6) Unionization has not affected the role of students in either institutional governance or governance in the philosophy department.

(7) No change in student grievances procedures. For Faculty grievance there is now a system-wide pool of faculty members to serve on any given grievance. Each campus elects its members, and the administration selects the ones to serve for any given case. Should the grievance not be resolved the case goes to "binding arbitration." (binding on both parties).

(8) There was certainly polarization during the bargaining. Whether this will continue now that a contract has been ratified remains to be seen.

(9) It has no effect on conflicts of groups within the philosophy department.

F. Appointment, Promotion and Tenure

(1) The contract does not affect any departmental decisions. Appointment remains the same procedure system-wide that it was before. Promotion and tenure are now judged at the college level by a union elected committee rather than a senate elected committee

(2) No, for reappointment or promotion. In the case of tenure one year has been added to the probation period for assistant professor, one year for associate professor, and no change for full professor.

(3) We had already introduced affirmative action objectives before unionization, and the introduction of a union made no additions to it.

(4) The faculty person now has access to his file, with the exception of the letters initially solicited for the first hire. All subsequent letters in a person's file are open to the person.

(5) Our contract specifies no rank or tenure quotas.

(6) No change. Part-time faculty are not eligible for promotion or tenure as before. However, in the former system a person on hard money then moved to soft money lost his tenure accumulation during the soft money period. Under the new system, once a person has started on the tenure track, a shift to soft money or to grant money does not affect the accumulation of tenure time.

(7) The grievant may appeal his case in the following steps:

1. Appeal to the Dean of the College. If he is turned down,
2. Appeal to the Chancellor. If the grievant is turned down,
3. Appeal to the President of the system. If the grievant is turned down,
4. Request the State Board of the union to carry it to binding arbitration. If the State Board agrees, the case goes to a binding arbitration decision. The arbitrator is selected by a joint consultation between union and management. If the State Board of the Union does not agree to take the case to binding arbitration, the grievant has no further steps within the contract to contest his case.

G. Economic aspects;

(1) As of March 18, 1975 the contract provides for:

a. Retroactive to November 1, 1974 $960 across the board, regardless of rank.
b. Retroactive to March 1, 1975, a 6% raise.
c. Effective July 1, 1975 a 7-1/2% raise.
Effective July 1, 1975 a 4% step raise.

(2) We did not have merit raises before the union, and we do not have them with the union.

(3) Yes, but there were such minima before. What the contract does is raise the minimum by about 30% for the bottom rank and 20% for the top rank.

(4) The contract called for an across the board sum of $948 regardless of rank, for nine months faculty, and $1,104 for eleven months faculty. This was not called a cost-of-living increase.

(5) Yes, the process tends to equalize salaries of persons at the same rank and with the same years of service, since there is no merit increase possible. It should be noted that this was the state of affairs before unionization also.

(6) There has been no effect on fringe benefits.

(7) There have been no fringe benefits introduced as yet, although some are contemplated.

(8) Dues are $102 per year.

(9) Unionization has not affected fringe benefits. There are none for part-time faculty and there were none before unionization. Salaries for part-time persons have, however, been raised, although not commensurate with full-time service rates.

(10) It should help every department since the salaries are higher.

(11) While the union has not played any role in remedying past salary inequities, affirmative action has done so in the cases of women and minorities.

Research Team

Irving Copi
Donald Wells

APPENDIX B

COMPARATIVE SALARY DATA ON SOME OF THE TARGET INSTITUTIONS

Average Percentage Difference in Average Compensation (salary and fringes) of Given Institutions Relative to Average Compensation of All Institutions of Same Category

Year	St. John's	Lehman	Temple	Rutgers	Hawaii	Cen. Mich.	Cal. St.
1967-68⊗	-10.7%	+11.8%	- 3.1%	+ 5.1%	- 3.6%	-8.4%	-19.5%
1968-69⊗	- 2.1	+14.8*	- 4.6	+ 1.4	- 4.6	-3.6	-14.2
1969-70⊗	- 0.6	+13.5	- 0.3	+ 0.1	- 3.2	-6.2*	-13.7
1970-71	+10.3*	+53.1	+12.0**	+13.4*	+12.0**	+5.5	-11.2
1971-72	+13.7	+50.6	+ 8.7	+11.7	+11.4	+8.9	-12.5
1972-73	+11.6	+48.1	+ 9.9*	+13.8	+ 8.7	+8.9	- 5.6*
1973-74	n.a.	+49.3	+10.1	+16.8	+ 4.3*	+9.6	+ 2.5
1974-75	+17.6	+45.8	+15.5	+14.8	+ 4.8	+8.8	+12.0

⊗ For these years, compensation figures are not given by rank in the AAUP survey. Instead, the rating for each rank plus number of full-time faculty in each rank are given, with average salary and average total compensation (salary plus fringes) for all ranks combined. The figures given here are derived from the abovementioned information plus Average Compensation Scale (which gives average compensation for each rating at each rank for the relevant year).

*First year of union collective bargaining agreement.

**Year organizing effort became visible.

Sources: Survey of institutions by APA representatives at named institutions, and annual salary surveys reported in AAUP Bulletin, Summer, 1968, through Summer, 1975.

ST. JOHN'S UNIVERSITY

Comparison of Compensation (salary and fringes) with
Average of Similar Institutions (Class I, Church Related)

	(in thousands)				(percentages)			
	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.
1967-68●	$ -3.129	$ -1.129	$ - .004	$ -1.130	-19.9%	- 8.8%	- .03%	-13.9%
1968-69●	- .562	+ .020	- .300	- .511	- 3.3	+ 1.5	- 2.7	- 4.0
1969-70●	- .469	- .016	- .335	+ .301	- 2.5	- 0.1	- 2.9	+ 3.3
*1970-71	+2.070	+2.000	+1.180	+ .860	+10.3	+12.9	+ 9.4	+ 8.6
1971-72	+3.200	+2.500	+1.700	+ .800	+15.6	+15.6	+16.2	+ 7.6
1972-73	+2.400	+2.300	+1.900	+ .800	+11.1	+13.6	+14	+ 7
1973-74	St. John's is not included in AAUP Survey							
1974-75	+3.460	+3.150	+3.070	+2.340	+14.6	+16.9	+20	+18.8

Note the shift at unionization from being almost uniformly <u>below</u> the average in all ranks in all years to being substantially <u>above</u> the average all ranks all years. The gains made appear to be quite stable over the years since unionization (in $ and %) for the upper ranks, while the lower ranks tend to improve their advantage over time. Thus, a tendency toward equalization may be discerned, but it is an equalizing <u>up</u> rather than down (i.e., the gains made by the lower ranks cannot be said to be at the expense of the higher ranks).

The meanings of the ● and * symbols are explained on the preceding page.

HERBERT LEHMAN COLLEGE, CUNY

Comparison of Compensation (salary and fringes) with
Average of Similar Institutions (Class I, Public)

	(in thousands)				(percentages)			
	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.
1967-68●	$+ 3.079	$ +2.107	$ + .797	$+ .491	+17.6%	+16.1%	+ 7.4%	+ 5.9%
*1968-69●	+ 8.271	+1.422	+ .403	+ .133	+44.2	+10.1	+ 3.5	+ 1.5
1969-70●	+ 8.532	+1.409	+ .256	- .011	+42.7	+ 9.4	+ 2.1	- 0.1
1970-71	+ 9.720	+7.680	+6.570	+6.630	+46.9	+48.5	+50.4	+66.5
1971-72	+10.030	+8.660	+6.890	+5.830	+44.2	+52.4	+50.6	+55.2
1972-73	+10.090	+8.710	+6.580	+5.560	+44.2	+51	+46.3	+50.8
1973-74	+10.670	+9.660	+7.230	+5.950	+44	+53.3	+48.3	+51.5
1974-75	+10.860	+9.890	+7.040	+5.420	+42.5	+51.8	+44.7	+44.1

Note that, with unionization, the advantage of Professor over the average jumps dramatically, while all other ranks lose some/all of their previous advantage during the first two years of unionization. But then their advantage jumps in 1970-71 so that it is greater than that of Professors. The advantage of all ranks appears relatively stable after that.

(Lehman has been treated as Class I rather than Class IIA for present purposes.)

The meanings of the ● and the * symbols are explained on p. 92.

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

Comparison of Compensation (salary and fringes) with
Average of Similar Institutions (Class I, Public)

	(in thousands)				(percentages)			
	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.
1967-68	$ -1.171	$ + .107	$ - .523	$ - .289	- 6.7%	+ .8%	- 4 %	- 2.5%
1968-69	-1.729	- .578	- .897	+ .233	- 9.2	- 4.1	- 7.7	+ 2.6
1969-70	-2.018	+1.409	+ .256	- .011	-10.1	+ 9.4	+ 2.1	+ 0.1
1970-71	+2.720	+2.180	+1.670	+ .830	+12.9	+13.8	+12.8	+ 8.3
1971-72	+2.630	+1.360	+ .890	+ .930	+11.6	+ 8.2	+ 6.5	+ 8.8
*1972-73	+2.990	+1.610	+1.080	+1.060	+13.1	+ 9.4	+ 7.6	+ 9.7
1973-74	+3.170	+1.760	+1.130	+1.190	+13	+ 9.7	+ 7.5	+10.3
1974-75	+3.860	+2.590	+2.040	+5.520	+15.1	+13.6	+12.9	+20.5

There appears to be some improvement with unionization, and the advantage appears to be growing. But the most dramatic improvement is in 1970-71. (This improvement is also related to unionization since this is when a state law was passed requiring all state-related institutions to provide opportunity for collective bargaining, and it is not unusual for substantial gains to be made during organizing drives.)

The meanings of the ⊗ and the * symbols are explained on p. 92.

RUTGERS UNIVERSITY

Comparison of compensation (salary and fringes) with
Average of Similar Institutions (Class I, Public)

	(in thousands)				(percentages)			
	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.
1967-68	$ +3.079	$ + .107	$ - .523	$ + .491	+17.6%	+ .8%	-4.0	+ 5.9
1968-69	+2.771	- .578	- .897	+ .233	+14.8	- 4.1	-7.7	+ 2.6
1969-70	+2.722	- .701	-1.054	- .011	+13.6	- 4.7	-8.5	- 0.1
*1970-71	+4.520	+2.080	+ .870	+1.230	+21.4	+13.1	+6.7	+12.3
1971-72	+4.830	+2.560	+1.090	+1.130	+21.3	+ 6.6	+8.0	+10.7
1972-73	+4.790	+2.710	+ .980	+1.260	+21	+15.9	+6.9	+11.5
1973-74	+6.070	+3.460	+1.430	+1.550	+25	+19	+9.6	+13.4
1974-75	+7.160	+1.540	+1.560	+1.620	+28	+ 8	+9.9	+13.2

The meanings of the and the * symbols are explained
on p. 92.

UNIVERSITY OF HAWAII

Comparison of Compensation (salary and fringes with Average of Similar Institutions (Class I, Public)

	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.
1967-68●	$ -1.171	$ + .107	$ - .523	$ - .289	- 6.7%	+ 0.8%	- 4.8%	- 3.5%
1968-69●	-1.729	- .578	- .897	+ .233	- 9.2	- 4.1	- 7.7	+ 2.6
1969-70●	-2.018	- .701	+ .256	- .011	-10.1	- 4.7	+ 2.1	- 0.1
1970-71	+3.320	+1.780	+1.370	+1.030	+15.7	+11.3	+10.5	+10.3
1971-72	+3.830	+2.160	+1.490	+ .930	+16.9	+ 9.0	+10.9	+ 8.8
1972-73	+2.890	+1.710	+ .980	+ .560	+12.7	+10	+ 6.9	+ 5.1
*1973-74	+1.970	+ .860	+ .430	+ .150	+ 8.1	+ 4.7	+ 2.9	+ 1.3
1974-75	+1.560	+ .790	+ .720	+ .520	+ 6.1	+ 4.1	+ 4.6	+ 4.2

Dramatic improvement in 1970-71.
State law requiring that collective bargaining be made available was passed in 1970. There followed a turbulent period of unionization (including election of one bargaining agent, negotiation of a contract, rejection of that contract, decertification of the agent, election of present bargaining agent in 1973, a long period of negotiation, and ratification of contract in March, 1975).

The meanings of the ● and the * symbols are explained on p. 92.

CENTRAL MICHIGAN UNIVERSITY

Comparison of Compensation (salary and fringes) with
Average of Similar Institutions (Class IIA, Public)

	(in thousands)				(percentages)			
	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.
1967-68 ⊗	$ -2.116	$ - .713	$ -1.041	$ - .243	-13.6%	- 6.6%	-10.2%	- 3.0%
1968-69 ⊗	+ .461	-1.293	- .332	- .391	+ 2.8	- 9.8	- 3.0	- 4.5
*1969-70 ⊗	- .101	-1.752	- .631	- .622	- 0.6	-12.2	- 5.3	- 6.6
1970-71	+2.000	+ .900	+ .430	+ .210	+10.5	+ 5.9	+ 3.4	+ 2.1
1971-72	+2.840	+1.400	+ .870	+ .590	+14.4	+ 8.9	+ 6.6	+ 5.5
1972-73	+2.900	+1.490	+ .980	+ .670	+13.8	+ 8.9	+ 7.0	+ 5.9
1973-74	+2.620	+1.620	+1.480	+ .970	+11.5	+ 9.0	+ 9.9	+ 7.9
1974-75	+1.850	+1.030	+1.160	+1.940	+ 7.6	+ 5.3	+ 7.3	+14.9

Dramatic improvement in year following unionization (seven months elapsed between election of bargaining agent and signing of contract). Some decrease in advantage of higher ranks recently ('72-75), increase for instructors (especially '74-75). Some equalizing tendency at work here.

The meanings of the ⊗ and the * symbols are explained on p. 92.

CALIFORNIA STATE COLLEGE (of Pennsylvania)

Comparison of Compensation (salary and fringes) with
Average of Similar Institutions (Class IIA, Public)

	(in thousands)				(percentages)			
	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.	Prof.	Assoc.	Asst.	Inst.
1967-68●	$ -4.666	$ -2.203	$ -1.041	$ -1.173	-35 %	-18 %	-10.2%	-14.4%
1968-69●	-2.939	-2.793	-1.472	- .391	-17.8	-21.2	-13.3	- 4.5
1969-70●	-3.691	-1.752	-1.831	- .622	-20.5	-12.2	-15.4	- 6.6
1970-71	-3.200	-1.700	-1.270	- .690	-16.8	-11.2	-10.0	- 6.8
1971-72	-3.260	-1.700	-1.630	-1.110	-16.5	-10.8	-12.3	-10.4
*1972-73	-2.200	- .810	- .820	- .130	-10.5	- 4.8	- 5.8	- 1.1
1973-74	- .380	+ .820	+ .480	+ .470	- 1.7	+ 4.6	+ 3.2	+ 3.8
1974-75	+2.450	+3.030	+2.560	+ .840	+10	+15.7	+16	+ 6.4

Approximately 9 months to signing of contract.
Note dramatic improvement over the two years following unionization.

The meanings of the ● and the * symbols are explained on p. 92.

APPENDIX C

ANALYSIS OF RESPONSES TO APA QUESTIONNAIRE

Early in 1975, a questionnaire was mailed to nearly 5,500 members of the APA. Not all these individuals were then employed in teaching positions. Some were graduate students, some were retired, some were employed in non-academic positions, and others were unemployed. There were 693 responses from teachers on campuses with no bargaining agent, and 136 responses from teachers on campuses with bargaining agents. The overall percentage of the answers to the various questions was reported in Section II. Here the responses are analyzed by various categories such as type of institution, rank, age, etc.

In all cases the actual number of respondents in any category is given in the rightmost column by numerals enclosed in parentheses. Whenever numerals appear within parentheses, the actual number is meant and not the percentage. When the number of responses in a given category is small, the percentage figures can be misleading.

There were 44 items on the questionnaire. Of these, the first ten were identification questions that enabled the respondents to be placed in categories presumed to be relevant to an analysis of the responses, e.g., type of institution, faculty rank, sex, etc. The fine-grain analysis of the remaining items is presented in this appendix with one exception. Item 12 of the APA questionnaire asked about current status of union activities on campus; the responses were deemed uninformative. The last three items of the questionnaire called for open-ended responses. The interpretation of these responses as "favorable," "unfavorable," etc. was done by Professor Schagrin.

A word of appreciation is due Professor Kenneth G. Lucey and Mr. George Golden at the State University College at Fredonia (N.Y.) for handling the programming chores that permitted this fine-grain analysis. Computer time was donated by SUNY at Fredonia.

Item 10. At this time, with regard to unionization on your campus, are you generally

NON-UNION	(A) In favor	(B) Opposed	(C) Undecided	
Total (N = 693)	38%	33%	29%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	15	51	34	(67)
2. 1-5 thousand	32	34	34	(233)
3. 5-10 thousand	41	35	24	(122)
4. Over 10,000	47	28	25	(271)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	42	21	36	(33)
2. BA	23	41	36	(145)
3. MA	46	26	28	(181)
4. PhD	39	35	26	(332)
Funding				
1. Public	48	25	27	(372)
2. Private (Sec.)	31	44	25	(163)
3. Private (Rel.)	22	41	37	(158)
Organization				
1. Department	40	34	27	(514)
2. Other	33	33	34	(178)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	26	35	39	(158)
2. 4-7	40	32	28	(188)
3. 8-15	45	33	22	(202)
4. 16 or more	40	32	28	(140)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	49	24	27	(37)
2. Asst. Prof.	52	16	32	(188)
3. Assoc. Prof.	41	29	30	(212)
4. Professor	23	52	25	(252)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	57	18	26	(62)
2. 4-7	49	17	34	(178)
3. 8 or more	31	42	26	(447)
Age				
1. Under 35	48	20	32	(236)
2. 35-45	37	34	30	(253)
3. 46 and over	28	48	25	(202)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	37	34	29	(591)
2. Female Cauc.	43	29	29	(77)
3. Male Other	47	24	29	(18)

Item 11. Has the issue of faculty unionization been raised at your institution?

NON-UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 693)	48%	52%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	24	76	(68)
2. 1-5 thousand	39	61	(228)
3. 5-10 thousand	53	47	(121)
4. Over 10,000	59	41	(272)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	61	39	(33)
2. BA	29	71	(145)
3. MA	53	47	(179)
4. PhD	52	48	(330)
Funding			
1. Public	61	39	(372)
2. Private (Sec.)	36	64	(162)
3. Private (Rel.)	28	72	(155)
Organization			
1. Department	51	49	(510)
2. Other	39	61	(178)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	35	65	(157)
2. 4-7	43	57	(187)
3. 8-15	53	47	(201)
4. 16 or more	60	40	(139)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	51	49	(37)
2. Asst. Prof.	43	57	(186)
3. Assoc. Prof.	51	49	(210)
4. Professor	49	51	(247)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	43	57	(61)
2. 4-7	46	54	(175)
3. 8 or more	50	50	(448)
Age			
1. Under 35	45	55	(233)
2. 35-45	50	50	(251)
3. 46 and over	49	51	(203)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	47	53	(589)
2. Female Cauc.	52	48	(75)
3. Male Other	39	61	(18)

Item 10. At this time, with regard to unionization on your campus, are you generally

UNION	(A) In favor	(B) Opposed	(C) Undecided	
Total (N = 144)	64%	26%	9%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	67	33	—	(6)
2. 1-5 thousand	67	24	9	(45)
3. 5-10 thousand	66	16	18	(38)
4. Over 10,000	62	33	6	(52)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	74	11	16	(19)
2. BA	70	22	9	(23)
3. MA	66	25	8	(59)
4. PhD	56	34	10	(41)
Funding				
1. Public	64	25	11	(118)
2. Private (Sec.)	86	7	7	(14)
3. Private (Rel.)	33	67	—	(9)
Organization				
1. Department	60	29	11	(91)
2. Other	73	20	8	(51)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	76	18	6	(33)
2. 4-7	66	18	16	(44)
3. 8-15	52	39	9	(33)
4. 16 or more	65	29	6	(31)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	70	10	20	(10)
2. Asst. Prof.	74	11	14	(35)
3. Assoc. Prof.	66	24	10	(41)
4. Professor	56	38	6	(55)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	46	15	39	(13)
2. 4-7	83	7	10	(30)
3. 8 or more	61	33	6	(98)
Age				
1. Under 35	75	10	15	(39)
2. 35-45	62	28	10	(50)
3. 46 and over	60	35	5	(52)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	62	28	11	(120)
2. Female Cauc.	86	7	7	(14)
3. Male Other	83	17	—	(6)

Item 13. In general, have faculty-administration relationships

UNION	(A) Improved	(B) Deteriorated	(C) Remained the same	
Total (N = 132)	17%	42%	40%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	0	60	40	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	25	35	40	(40)
3. 5-10 thousand	18	50	32	(38)
4. Over 10,000	12	40	48	(48)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	28	33	39	(18)
2. BA	4	59	36	(22)
3. MA	23	44	33	(52)
4. PhD	13	37	50	(38)
Funding				
1. Public	17	41	42	(113)
2. Private (Sec.)	23	54	23	(13)
3. Private (Rel.)	20	60	20	(5)
Organization				
1. Department	15	41	44	(82)
2. Other	22	44	34	(50)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	30	37	33	(30)
2. 4-7	18	44	38	(39)
3. 8-15	19	48	32	(31)
4. 16 or more	3	39	58	(31)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	22	22	56	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	22	44	34	(32)
3. Assoc. Prof.	13	50	37	(38)
4. Professor	15	40	45	(52)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	18	46	36	(11)
2. 4-7	18	43	39	(28)
3. 8 or more	17	42	41	(93)
Age				
1. Under 35	17	37	46	(35)
2. 35-45	13	53	34	(47)
3. 46 and over	20	37	43	(49)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	15	41	44	(110)
2. Female Cauc.	29	50	21	(14)
3. Male Other	17	50	33	(6)

Item 14. Faculty control over educational policies has

UNION	(A) Increased	(B) Decreased	(C) Remained about the same	
Total (N = 135)	27%	22%	51%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	40	—	60	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	34	12	54	(41)
3. 5-10 thousand	31	26	44	(39)
4. Over 10,000	16	30	54	(50)
Highest Degree Giver				
1. AA	35	12	53	(17)
2. BA	32	9	59	(22)
3. MA	32	26	42	(57)
4. PhD	13	28	59	(39)
Funding				
1. Public	24	25	51	(116)
2. Private (Sec.)	39	8	54	(13)
3. Private (Rel.)	60	—	40	(5)
Organization				
1. Department	21	24	55	(86)
2. Other	32	16	52	(49)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	52	17	31	(29)
2. 4-7	31	19	50	(42)
3. 8-15	13	23	64	(31)
4. 16 or more	12	28	60	(32)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	22	11	67	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	25	25	50	(32)
3. Assoc. Prof.	30	20	50	(40)
4. Professor	23	25	52	(53)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	9	27	64	(11)
2. 4-7	21	25	54	(28)
3. 8 or more	30	21	49	(96)
Age				
1. Under 35	19	25	56	(36)
2. 35-45	31	25	44	(48)
3. 46 and over	28	18	54	(50)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	26	22	51	(113)
2. Female Cauc.	29	14	57	(14)
3. Male Other	33	50	17	(6)

Item 15. Faculty control over budgetary priorities has

UNION	(A) Increased	(B) Decreased	(C) Remained the same	
Total (N = 134)	22%	23%	55%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	60	20	20	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	15	17	68	(41)
3. 5-10 thousand	33	23	44	(39)
4. Over 10,000	14	29	57	(49)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	41	12	47	(17)
2. BA	27	4	68	(22)
3. MA	21	30	49	(57)
4. PhD	10	29	61	(38)
Funding				
1. Public	21	23	56	(115)
2. Private (Sec.)	15	38	46	(13)
3. Private (Rel.)	60	—	40	(5)
Organization				
1. Department	16	28	55	(85)
2. Other	31	14	55	(49)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	38	10	52	(29)
2. 4-7	19	21	60	(42)
3. 8-15	23	35	42	(31)
4. 16 or more	9	26	65	(31)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	33	11	56	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	22	25	53	(32)
3. Assoc. Prof.	23	26	51	(39)
4. Professor	17	23	60	(53)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	36	9	55	(11)
2. 4-7	18	32	50	(28)
3. 8 or more	21	22	57	(95)
Age				
1. Under 35	28	25	47	(36)
2. 35-45	13	30	57	(47)
3. 46 and over	26	16	58	(50)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	23	22	55	(112)
2. Female Cauc.	21	21	57	(14)
3. Male Other	—	50	50	(6)

Item 16. If your institution had a faculty governing body before unionization, is its power at this time

UNION	(A) More	(B) Less	(C) About the same	
Total (N = 123)	10%	41%	50%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	40	40	20	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	14	53	33	(36)
3. 5-10 thousand	9	34	57	(35)
4. Over 10,000	4	36	60	(47)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	21	29	50	(14)
2. BA	15	55	30	(20)
3. MA	10	40	50	(52)
4. PhD	3	38	60	(37)
Funding				
1. Public	8	42	51	(106)
2. Private (Sec.)	17	33	50	(12)
3. Private (Rel.)	50	50	—	(4)
Organization				
1. Department	9	38	53	(81)
2. Other	12	45	43	(42)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	26	30	44	(23)
2. 4-7	10	46	44	(41)
3. 8-15	—	43	57	(28)
4. 16 or more	7	40	53	(30)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	43	—	57	(7)
2. Asst. Prof.	10	37	53	(30)
3. Assoc. Prof.	11	32	57	(37)
4. Professor	4	55	41	(49)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	33	22	44	(9)
2. 4-7	4	31	65	(26)
3. 8 or more	10	45	45	(88)
Age				
1. Under 35	12	27	61	(33)
2. 35-45	9	47	44	(45)
3. 46 and over	10	45	45	(44)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	11	39	50	(105)
2. Female Cauc.	8	42	50	(12)
3. Male Other	—	75	25	(4)

Item 17. Since unionization, is the amount of flexibility in curricular innovation

UNION	(A) More	(B) Less	(C) About the same	
Total (N = 129)	8%	19%	73%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	—	40	60	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	10	26	64	(39)
3. 5-10 thousand	8	11	82	(38)
4. Over 10,000	8	17	75	(47)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	12	25	63	(16)
2. BA	9	27	64	(22)
3. MA	7	20	73	(55)
4. PhD	8	8	83	(36)
Funding				
1. Public	7	20	73	(111)
2. Private (Sec.)	23	—	77	(13)
3. Private (Rel.)	—	50	50	(4)
Organization				
1. Department	9	15	77	(82)
2. Other	9	26	65	(47)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	15	26	59	(27)
2. 4-7	7	19	74	(42)
3. 8-15	10	17	73	(30)
4. 16 or more	3	14	83	(29)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	—	—	100	(8)
2. Asst. Prof.	16	19	66	(32)
3. Assoc. Prof.	8	18	74	(38)
4. Professor	6	22	72	(50)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	10	20	70	(10)
2. 4-7	11	19	70	(27)
3. 8 or more	8	18	74	(92)
Age				
1. Under 35	11	20	69	(35)
2. 35-45	9	20	72	(46)
3. 46 and over	6	17	77	(47)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	7	17	76	(108)
2. Female Cauc.	21	14	64	(14)
3. Male Other	—	80	20	(5)

Item 18. Was there a policy of merit increases prior to unionization?

	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 131)	67%	32%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	67	33	(6)
2. 1-5 thousand	60	40	(42)
3. 5-10 thousand	71	29	(38)
4. Over 10,000	71	29	(45)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	44	56	(18)
2. BA	57	43	(21)
3. MA	73	27	(55)
4. PhD	76	24	(37)
Funding			
1. Public	68	32	(109)
2. Private (Sec.)	57	43	(14)
3. Private (Rel.)	71	29	(7)
Organization			
1. Department	73	27	(82)
2. Other	57	43	(49)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	62	38	(32)
2. 4-7	69	31	(39)
3. 8-15	69	31	(29)
4. 16 or more	70	30	(30)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	40	60	(10)
2. Asst. Prof.	64	36	(31)
3. Assoc. Prof.	61	39	(36)
4. Professor	81	19	(53)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	62	38	(13)
2. 4-7	64	36	(28)
3. 8 or more	69	31	(90)
Age			
1. Under 35	63	37	(35)
2. 35-45	73	27	(45)
3. 46 and over	66	34	(50)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	70	30	(110)
2. Female Cauc.	46	54	(13)
3. Male Other	67	33	(6)

Item 19. Does your contract provide for merit increases?

UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 136)	53%	47%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	20	80	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	48	52	(42)
3. 5-10 thousand	60	40	(37)
4. Over 10,000	55	45	(51)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	28	72	(18)
2. BA	41	59	(22)
3. MA	56	44	(57)
4. PhD	67	33	(39)
Funding			
1. Public	56	44	(116)
2. Private (Sec.)	27	73	(11)
3. Private (Rel.)	37	63	(8)
Organization			
1. Department	61	39	(87)
2. Other	39	61	(49)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	40	60	(30)
2. 4-7	67	33	(42)
3. 8-15	45	55	(31)
4. 16 or more	56	44	(32)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	40	60	(10)
2. Asst. Prof.	59	41	(34)
3. Assoc. Prof.	60	40	(38)
4. Professor	47	53	(53)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	69	31	(13)
2. 4-7	50	50	(28)
3. 8 or more	52	48	(94)
Age			
1. Under 35	54	46	(39)
2. 35-45	67	33	(45)
3. 46 and over	41	59	(51)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	57	43	(116)
2. Female Cauc.	25	75	(12)
3. Male Other	50	50	(6)

Item 20. (If applicable) Under unionization, the size of merit increases is

UNION	(A) Greater	(B) Less	(C) About the same as before	
Total (N = 70)	19%	49%	33%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	—	—	100	(1)
2. 1-5 thousand	16	37	47	(19)
3. 5-10 thousand	28	40	32	(25)
4. Over 10,000	12	68	20	(25)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	40	40	20	(5)
2. BA	—	33	67	(9)
3. MA	31	31	38	(32)
4. PhD	4	79	17	(24)
Funding				
1. Public	20	50	30	(66)
2. Private (Sec.)	—	33	67	(3)
3. Private (Rel.)	—	—	—	—
Organization				
1. Department	16	61	22	(49)
2. Other	24	19	57	(21)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	25	17	58	(12)
2. 4-7	35	35	31	(26)
3. 8-15	7	57	36	(14)
4. 16 or more	—	83	17	(18)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	33	67	—	(3)
2. Asst. Prof.	25	44	31	(16)
3. Assoc. Prof.	23	41	36	(22)
4. Professor	10	55	35	(29)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	33	50	17	(6)
2. 4-7	7	27	67	(15)
3. 8 or more	20	55	25	(49)
Age				
1. Under 35	17	44	39	(18)
2. 35-45	21	54	25	(28)
3. 46 and over	13	48	39	(23)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	18	51	32	(63)
2. Female Cauc.	—	50	50	(2)
3. Male Other	25	25	50	(4)

Item 21. (If applicable) Would you attribute the change in merit increases to unionization?

UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 65)	63%	37%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	—	—	—
2. 1-5 thousand	69	31	(16)
3. 5-10 thousand	50	50	(22)
4. Over 10,000	73	27	(26)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	60	40	(5)
2. BA	40	60	(5)
3. MA	83	17	(33)
4. PhD	63	37	(22)
Funding			
1. Public	65	35	(60)
2. Private (Sec.)	67	33	(3)
3. Private (Rel.)	—	100	(1)
Organization			
1. Department	65	35	(48)
2. Other	59	41	(17)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	50	50	(10)
2. 4-7	70	30	(27)
3. 8-15	64	36	(11)
4. 16 or more	59	41	(17)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	67	33	(3)
2. Asst. Prof.	53	47	(17)
3. Assoc. Prof.	61	39	(18)
4. Professor	70	30	(27)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	83	17	(6)
2. 4-7	36	64	(11)
3. 8 or more	67	33	(48)
Age			
1. Under 35	50	50	(16)
2. 35-45	71	29	(28)
3. 46 and over	62	38	(21)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	67	33	(58)
2. Female Cauc.	25	75	(4)
3. Male Other	33	67	(3)

Item 22. In making offers to prospective faculty members, is departmental flexibility

UNION	(A) Greater	(B) Less	(C) About the same	
Total (N = 125)	5%	26%	69%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	—	60	40	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	11	18	71	(38)
3. 5-10 thousand	3	31	66	(35)
4. Over 10,000	2	24	74	(46)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	12	24	65	(17)
2. BA	5	29	67	(21)
3. MA	6	27	67	(52)
4. PhD	—	26	74	(35)
Funding				
1. Public	5	24	72	(106)
2. Private (Sec.)	—	33	67	(12)
3. Private (Rel.)	17	67	17	(6)
Organization				
1. Department	4	27	69	(78)
2. Other	6	25	69	(47)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	15	27	58	(26)
2. 4-7	—	24	76	(41)
3. 8-15	7	25	68	(28)
4. 16 or more	—	31	69	(29)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	—	—	100	(8)
2. Asst. Prof.	6	25	69	(32)
3. Assoc. Prof.	6	28	67	(36)
4. Professor	4	31	65	(48)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	—	20	80	(10)
2. 4-7	8	8	85	(26)
3. 8 or more	4	33	63	(89)
Age				
1. Under 35	3	21	76	(34)
2. 35-45	9	39	52	(44)
3. 46 and over	2	22	78	(46)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	4	26	71	(106)
2. Female Cauc.	15	31	54	(13)
3. Male Other	—	25	75	(4)

Item 23. In meeting offers from other institutions to current staff, is the amount of departmental flexibility under the contract

UNION	(A) Greater	(B) Less	(C) About the same as before	
Total (N = 114)	4%	30%	66%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	—	33	67	(3)
2. 1-5 thousand	6	26	68	(34)
3. 5-10 thousand	9	38	53	(32)
4. Over 10,000	—	27	73	(45)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	15	15	69	(13)
2. BA	—	33	67	(18)
3. MA	6	30	64	(50)
4. PhD	—	33	67	(33)
Funding				
1. Public	4	30	66	(99)
2. Private (Sec.)	—	22	78	(9)
3. Private (Rel.)	20	40	40	(5)
Organization				
1. Department	4	32	63	(71)
2. Other	5	26	69	(43)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	10	20	70	(20)
2. 4-7	2	28	70	(40)
3. 8-15	8	40	52	(25)
4. 16 or more	—	32	68	(28)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	—	14	86	(7)
2. Asst. Prof.	4	40	56	(25)
3. Assoc. Prof.	6	28	67	(33)
4. Professor	5	29	67	(48)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	—	38	62	(8)
2. 4-7	—	24	76	(21)
3. 8 or more	6	31	63	(85)
Age				
1. Under 35	—	36	64	(28)
2. 35-45	7	32	61	(41)
3. 46 and over	4	24	72	(45)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	4	28	68	(99)
2. Female Cauc.	10	30	60	(10)
3. Male Other	—	50	50	(4)

Item 24. Compared with the situation prior to unionization, is the teaching workload

UNION	(A) Greater	(B) Less	(C) About the same	
Total (N = 129)	12%	9%	79%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	20	—	80	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	12	2	86	(40)
3. 5-10 thousand	19	8	72	(36)
4. Over 10,000	6	15	79	(48)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	18	12	71	(17)
2. BA	16	11	74	(19)
3. MA	11	5	84	(57)
4. PhD	11	11	78	(36)
Funding				
1. Public	13	10	78	(111)
2. Private (Sec.)	—	—	100	(12)
3. Private (Rel.)	40	—	60	(5)
Organization				
1. Department	11	7	82	(81)
2. Other	16	10	74	(48)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	11	11	78	(27)
2. 4-7	8	3	90	(39)
3. 8-15	19	19	63	(32)
4. 16 or more	13	3	84	(30)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	11	—	89	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	9	23	68	(31)
3. Assoc. Prof.	8	8	83	(36)
4. Professor	17	2	81	(52)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	20	—	80	(10)
2. 4-7	7	22	70	(27)
3. 8 or more	13	5	82	(91)
Age				
1. Under 35	11	14	75	(36)
2. 35-45	13	7	80	(45)
3. 46 and over	13	4	83	(47)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	15	6	79	(109)
2. Female Cauc.	—	15	85	(13)
3. Male Other	—	20	80	(5)

Item 25. If your workload has changed, would you attribute this directly to unionization?

UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 48)	31%	69%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	100	—	(1)
2. 1-5 thousand	14	86	(14)
3. 5-10 thousand	47	53	(15)
4. Over 10,000	28	72	(18)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	80	20	(5)
2. BA	50	50	(8)
3. MA	30	70	(23)
4. PhD	—	100	(12)
Funding			
1. Public	33	67	(42)
2. Private (Sec.)	—	100	(3)
3. Private (Rel.)	33	67	(3)
Organization			
1. Department	18	82	(28)
2. Other	50	50	(20)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	63	37	(8)
2. 4-7	27	73	(15)
3. 8-15	33	67	(15)
4. 16 or more	11	89	(9)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	—	—	—
2. Asst. Prof.	50	50	(16)
3. Assoc. Prof.	18	82	(11)
4. Professor	24	76	(21)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	33	67	(3)
2. 4-7	46	54	(11)
3. 8 or more	26	74	(34)
Age			
1. Under 35	31	69	(13)
2. 35-45	33	67	(15)
3. 46 and over	26	74	(19)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	31	69	(39)
2. Female Cauc.	33	67	(3)
3. Male Other	25	75	(4)

Item 26. Has unionization resulted in a faculty whose quality is

UNION	(A) Higher	(B) Lower	(C) About the same as before	
Total (N = 123)	6%	18%	76%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	—	20	80	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	—	15	85	(39)
3. 5-10 thousand	9	17	74	(35)
4. Over 10,000	9	21	70	(44)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	13	—	87	(15)
2. BA	5	26	68	(19)
3. MA	4	20	76	(54)
4. PhD	6	17	77	(35)
Funding				
1. Public	7	17	76	(104)
2. Private (Sec.)	—	8	92	(13)
3. Private (Rel.)	—	60	40	(5)
Organization				
1. Department	4	22	74	(77)
2. Other	9	11	80	(46)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	4	13	83	(24)
2. 4-7	3	15	82	(39)
3. 8-15	13	30	57	(30)
4. 16 or more	3	14	83	(29)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	—	17	83	(6)
2. Asst. Prof.	13	13	74	(31)
3. Assoc. Prof.	8	14	78	(36)
4. Professor	—	24	76	(49)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	11	33	56	(9)
2. 4-7	7	7	85	(27)
3. 8 or more	5	20	75	(87)
Age				
1. Under 35	9	15	76	(34)
2. 35-45	7	22	71	(45)
3. 46 and over	2	16	82	(43)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	4	17	79	(103)
2. Female Cauc.	21	—	79	(14)
3. Male Other	—	75	25	(4)

Item 27. Had you not unionized, do you think your current salary would be

UNION	(A) Higher	(B) Lower	(C) About the same	
Total (N = 131)	12%	54%	34%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	20	80	—	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	3	54	43	(39)
3. 5-10 thousand	13	50	37	(38)
4. Over 10,000	18	55	27	(49)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	—	75	25	(16)
2. BA	9	67	24	(21)
3. MA	12	51	37	(57)
4. PhD	19	43	38	(37)
Funding				
1. Public	12	55	33	(112)
2. Private (Sec.)	8	62	31	(13)
3. Private (Rel.)	20	20	60	(5)
Organization				
1. Department	17	48	36	(84)
2. Other	4	66	30	(47)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	4	77	19	(26)
2. 4-7	7	56	37	(43)
3. 8-15	26	48	26	(31)
4. 16 or more	13	30	57	(30)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	—	50	50	(8)
2. Asst. Prof.	15	55	30	(33)
3. Assoc. Prof.	5	70	24	(37)
4. Professor	17	42	41	(52)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	9	55	36	(11)
2. 4-7	11	67	22	(27)
3. 8 or more	13	50	37	(92)
Age				
1. Under 35	14	65	21	(37)
2. 35-45	13	53	33	(45)
3. 46 and over	10	46	44	(48)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	14	53	34	(110)
2. Female Cauc.	7	71	21	(14)
3. Male Other	—	40	60	(5)

Item 28. Prior to unionization, was there any avenue of appeal on the occasion of the non-reappointment of non-tenured faculty.

UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 134)	63%	37%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	100	—	(6)
2. 1-5 thousand	56	44	(41)
3. 5-10 thousand	72	28	(39)
4. Over 10,000	57	43	(47)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	56	44	(18)
2. BA	68	32	(22)
3. MA	55	45	(58)
4. PhD	78	22	(36)
Funding			
1. Public	61	39	(111)
2. Private (Sec.)	71	29	(14)
3. Private (Rel.)	87	13	(8)
Organization			
1. Department	62	38	(85)
2. Other	65	35	(49)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	56	44	(32)
2. 4-7	51	49	(41)
3. 8-15	84	16	(31)
4. 16 or more	66	34	(29)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	33	67	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	61	39	(33)
3. Assoc. Prof.	60	40	(38)
4. Professor	74	26	(53)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	40	60	(10)
2. 4-7	53	47	(30)
3. 8 or more	69	31	(94)
Age			
1. Under 35	46	54	(35)
2. 35-45	69	31	(48)
3. 46 and over	70	30	(50)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	63	37	(114)
2. Female Cauc.	50	50	(12)
3. Male Other	83	17	(6)

Item 29. Under your contract, are there circumstances under which non-reappointment is appealable (or grievable)?

UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 134)	94%	6%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	100	—	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	93	7	(41)
3. 5-10 thousand	90	10	(38)
4. Over 10,000	98	2	(49)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	94	6	(17)
2. BA	91	9	(22)
3. MA	95	5	(57)
4. PhD	95	5	(38)
Funding			
1. Public	95	5	(113)
2. Private (Sec.)	92	8	(12)
3. Private (Rel.)	87	13	(8)
Organization			
1. Department	93	7	(87)
2. Other	96	4	(47)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	93	7	(28)
2. 4-7	93	7	(43)
3. 8-15	97	3	(32)
4. 16 or more	93	7	(30)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	78	22	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	94	6	(34)
3. Assoc. Prof.	95	5	(38)
4. Professor	96	4	(52)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	83	17	(12)
2. 4-7	96	4	(27)
3. 8 or more	95	5	(94)
Age			
1. Under 35	89	11	(38)
2. 35-45	93	7	(45)
3. 46 and over	98	2	(50)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	94	6	(114)
2. Female Cauc.	92	8	(13)
3. Male Other	100	—	(5)

Item 30. Are you aware of any retrenchment policies your institution had prior to unionization?

UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 136)	29%	71%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	50	50	(6)
2. 1-5 thousand	19	81	(42)
3. 5-10 thousand	31	69	(39)
4. Over 10,000	33	67	(49)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	38	62	(16)
2. BA	26	74	(23)
3. MA	20	80	(59)
4. PhD	40	60	(38)
Funding			
1. Public	27	73	(115)
2. Private (Sec.)	36	64	(14)
3. Private (Rel.)	50	50	(6)
Organization			
1. Department	30	70	(86)
2. Other	26	74	(50)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	38	62	(29)
2. 4-7	16	84	(43)
3. 8-15	27	73	(33)
4. 16 or more	40	60	(30)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	56	44	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	29	71	(34)
3. Assoc. Prof.	25	75	(40)
4. Professor	25	75	(52)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	33	67	(12)
2. 4-7	21	79	(29)
3. 8 or more	31	69	(94)
Age			
1. Under 35	23	77	(39)
2. 35-45	42	58	(48)
3. 46 and over	21	79	(48)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	30	70	(114)
2. Female Cauc.	14	86	(14)
3. Male Other	33	67	(6)

Item 31. If your contract contains provisions for retrenchment, the procedures specified are

UNION	(A) Good	(B) Poor	(C) Satisfactory (acceptable under the circumstances)	
Total (N = 103)	16%	22%	62%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	20	—	80	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	18	29	53	(34)
3. 5-10 thousand	13	23	65	(31)
4. Over 10,000	15	18	67	(33)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	17	—	83	(12)
2. BA	13	27	60	(15)
3. MA	25	30	45	(44)
4. PhD	3	19	78	(32)
Funding				
1. Public	14	25	61	(85)
2. Private (Sec.)	27	18	55	(11)
3. Private (Rel.)	17	—	83	(6)
Organization				
1. Department	13	27	60	(67)
2. Other	19	14	67	(36)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	14	18	68	(22)
2. 4-7	21	33	46	(33)
3. 8-15	17	21	62	(24)
4. 16 or more	8	12	79	(24)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	17	—	83	(7)
2. Asst. Prof.	21	29	50	(24)
3. Assoc. Prof.	10	32	58	(31)
4. Professor	15	15	70	(40)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	11	33	56	(9)
2. 4-7	23	41	36	(22)
3. 8 or more	14	15	71	(72)
Age				
1. Under 35	20	33	47	(30)
2. 35-45	11	22	68	(37)
3. 46 and over	17	14	69	(35)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	18	21	61	(90)
2. Female Cauc.	—	25	75	(8)
3. Male Other	—	67	33	(3)

Item 32. Does your institution have an explicit quota on ranks?

UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 137)	15%	85%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	—	100	(6)
2. 1-5 thousand	20	80	(44)
3. 5-10 thousand	6	94	(35)
4. Over 10,000	18	82	(51)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	—	100	(16)
2. BA	12	88	(24)
3. MA	23	77	(56)
4. PhD	10	90	(41)
Funding			
1. Public	17	83	(114)
2. Private (Sec.)	7	93	(14)
3. Private (Rel.)	—	100	(8)
Organization			
1. Department	11	89	(88)
2. Other	20	80	(49)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	7	93	(30)
2. 4-7	19	81	(43)
3. 8-15	17	83	(30)
4. 16 or more	15	85	(33)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	—	100	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	20	80	(35)
3. Assoc. Prof.	18	82	(39)
4. Professor	11	89	(54)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	8	92	(12)
2. 4-7	17	83	(29)
3. 8 or more	15	85	(96)
Age			
1. Under 35	16	84	(37)
2. 35-45	16	84	(49)
3. 46 and over	12	88	(51)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	15	85	(117)
2. Female Cauc.	14	86	(14)
3. Male Other	—	100	(5)

Item 33. Would you attribute the situation described in Item 32 to the union?

UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 114)	19%	81%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	—	100	(3)
2. 1-5 thousand	8	92	(37)
3. 5-10 thousand	18	82	(33)
4. Over 10,000	32	58	(40)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	15	85	(13)
2. BA	16	84	(19)
3. MA	16	84	(49)
4. PhD	27	73	(33)
Funding			
1. Public	20	80	(99)
2. Private (Sec.)	22	78	(9)
3. Private (Rel.)	—	100	(5)
Organization			
1. Department	21	79	(75)
2. Other	15	85	(39)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	10	90	(20)
2. 4-7	12	88	(40)
3. 8-15	28	72	(25)
4. 16 or more	29	71	(28)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	14	86	(7)
2. Asst. Prof.	24	76	(29)
3. Assoc. Prof.	28	72	(36)
4. Professor	9	91	(42)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	40	60	(10)
2. 4-7	19	81	(21)
3. 8 or more	17	83	(83)
Age			
1. Under 35	31	69	(29)
2. 35-45	21	79	(44)
3. 46 and over	10	90	(40)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	16	84	(95)
2. Female Cauc.	50	50	(12)
3. Male Other	20	80	(5)

Item 34. Does your institution have an explicit quota on tenured faculty?

UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 136)	10%	90%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	—	100	(6)
2. 1-5 thousand	16	84	(42)
3. 5-10 thousand	5	95	(37)
4. Over 10,000	10	90	(51)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	6	94	(16)
2. BA	13	87	(23)
3. MA	14	86	(56)
4. PhD	5	95	(41)
Funding			
1. Public	10	90	(116)
2. Private (Sec.)	17	83	(12)
3. Private (Rel.)	14	86	(7)
Organization			
1. Department	11	89	(88)
2. Other	8	92	(48)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	10	90	(29)
2. 4-7	14	86	(42)
3. 8-15	10	90	(31)
4. 16 or more	6	94	(33)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	11	89	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	18	82	(33)
3. Assoc. Prof.	3	97	(38)
4. Professor	11	89	(55)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	18	82	(11)
2. 4-7	10	90	(29)
3. 8 or more	9	91	(95)
Age			
1. Under 35	11	89	(37)
2. 35-45	8	92	(48)
3. 46 and over	12	88	(51)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	10	90	(116)
2. Female Cauc.	—	100	(13)
3. Male Other	33	67	(6)

Item 35. Would you attribute the situation described in Item 34 to the union?

	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 115)	22%	78%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	—	100	(3)
2. 1-5 thousand	10	90	(40)
3. 5-10 thousand	25	75	(32)
4. Over 10,000	33	67	(40)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	15	85	(13)
2. BA	16	84	(19)
3. MA	24	76	(50)
4. PhD	24	76	(33)
Funding			
1. Public	24	76	(100)
2. Private (Sec.)	10	90	(10)
3. Private (Rel.)	—	100	(4)
Organization			
1. Department	26	74	(74)
2. Other	15	85	(41)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	9	91	(22)
2. 4-7	21	79	(38)
3. 8-15	27	73	(26)
4. 16 or more	29	71	(28)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	14	86	(7)
2. Asst. Prof.	23	77	(30)
3. Assoc. Prof.	24	76	(33)
4. Professor	20	80	(44)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	40	60	(10)
2. 4-7	17	83	(24)
3. 8 or more	20	80	(80)
Age			
1. Under 35	31	69	(32)
2. 35-45	23	77	(43)
3. 46 and over	12	88	(40)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	21	79	(97)
2. Female Cauc.	42	58	(12)
3. Male Other	—	100	(5)

Item 36. Does your contract support Affirmative Action programs?

UNION	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 123)	70%	30%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	80	20	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	63	37	(38)
3. 5-10 thousand	80	20	(35)
4. Over 10,000	67	33	(45)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	71	29	(14)
2. BA	65	35	(20)
3. MA	76	24	(54)
4. PhD	63	37	(35)
Funding			
1. Public	72	28	(102)
2. Private (Sec.)	58	42	(12)
3. Private (Rel.)	75	25	(8)
Organization			
1. Department	66	34	(79)
2. Other	77	23	(44)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	52	48	(27)
2. 4-7	73	27	(37)
3. 8-15	83	17	(29)
4. 16 or more	70	30	(30)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	62	38	(8)
2. Asst. Prof.	68	32	(28)
3. Assoc. Prof.	70	30	(37)
4. Professor	71	29	(49)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	67	33	(12)
2. 4-7	60	40	(25)
3. 8 or more	73	27	(86)
Age			
1. Under 35	65	35	(34)
2. 35-45	69	31	(42)
3. 46 and over	74	26	(47)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	72	28	(103)
2. Female Cauc.	77	23	(13)
3. Male Other	17	83	(6)

Item 37. Does your contract outline procedures for handling student grievances?

	(A) Yes	(B) No	
Total (N = 123)	25%	75%	
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	20	80	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	19	81	(37)
3. 5-10 thousand	33	67	(36)
4. Over 10,000	23	77	(44)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	22	78	(18)
2. BA	25	75	(20)
3. MA	28	72	(53)
4. PhD	22	78	(32)
Funding			
1. Public	26	74	(103)
2. Private (Sec.)	9	91	(11)
3. Private (Rel.)	38	62	(8)
Organization			
1. Department	27	73	(77)
2. Other	22	78	(46)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	23	77	(30)
2. 4-7	29	71	(38)
3. 8-15	32	68	(28)
4. 16 or more	15	85	(26)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	10	90	(10)
2. Asst. Prof.	20	80	(30)
3. Assoc. Prof.	28	72	(36)
4. Professor	30	70	(46)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	42	58	(12)
2. 4-7	18	82	(27)
3. 8 or more	25	75	(84)
Age			
1. Under 35	26	74	(35)
2. 35-45	22	78	(41)
3. 46 and over	28	72	(46)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	26	74	(104)
2. Female Cauc.	17	83	(12)
3. Male Other	33	67	(6)

Item 38. Since unionization, in responding to student grievances and complaints, has your institution been

UNION	(A) More vigorous	(B) Less vigorous	(C) About the same	
Total (N = 115)	10%	3%	87%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	—	—	100	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	12	—	88	(32)
3. 5-10 thousand	11	—	89	(35)
4. Over 10,000	9	7	84	(43)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	13	—	87	(15)
2. BA	10	—	90	(19)
3. MA	11	2	87	(47)
4. PhD	9	6	85	(34)
Funding				
1. Public	9	3	88	(98)
2. Private (Sec.)	17	—	83	(12)
3. Private (Rel.)	25	—	75	(4)
Organization				
1. Department	11	4	85	(71)
2. Other	9	—	91	(44)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	17	—	83	(24)
2. 4-7	5	3	92	(37)
3. 8-15	18	4	78	(27)
4. 16 or more	4	4	92	(26)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	14	—	86	(7)
2. Asst. Prof.	11	—	89	(28)
3. Assoc. Prof.	9	—	91	(34)
4. Professor	11	7	82	(45)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	11	—	89	(9)
2. 4-7	17	—	83	(23)
3. 8 or more	8	4	88	(83)
Age				
1. Under 35	13	—	87	(31)
2. 35-45	3	—	97	(39)
3. 46 and over	16	7	77	(44)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	11	2	87	(97)
2. Female Cauc.	8	—	92	(12)
3. Male Other	—	20	80	(5)

Item 39. After unionization, are relations between students and faculty

UNION	(A) Better	(B) Worse	(C) About the same	
Total (N = 123)	14%	15%	71%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	—	20	80	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	14	11	75	(37)
3. 5-10 thousand	14	28	58	(36)
4. Over 10,000	16	7	78	(45)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	24	18	59	(17)
2. BA	5	20	75	(20)
3. MA	16	18	66	(51)
4. PhD	11	6	83	(35)
Funding				
1. Public	12	14	73	(105)
2. Private (Sec.)	23	15	62	(13)
3. Private (Rel.)	25	25	50	(4)
Organization				
1. Department	13	12	75	(75)
2. Other	15	19	66	(48)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	21	18	61	(28)
2. 4-7	14	16	70	(37)
3. 8-15	15	22	63	(27)
4. 16 or more	7	3	90	(30)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	38	—	62	(8)
2. Asst. Prof.	13	—	87	(30)
3. Assoc. Prof.	19	24	57	(37)
4. Professor	6	19	75	(47)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	25	—	75	(8)
2. 4-7	18	7	74	(27)
3. 8 or more	11	18	71	(88)
Age				
1. Under 35	19	—	81	(32)
2. 35-45	11	24	65	(46)
3. 46 and over	11	16	73	(44)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	14	15	71	(104)
2. Female Cauc.	8	8	85	(13)
3. Male Other	25	25	50	(4)

Item 40. Does your contract guarantee faculty members access to their own files?

UNION	(A) Yes 70%	(B) No 30%	
Total (N = 124)			
Number of Students			
1. Less than 1000	80	20	(5)
2. 1-5 thousand	72	28	(39)
3. 5-10 thousand	82	18	(33)
4. Over 10,000	61	39	(46)
Highest Degree Given			
1. AA	82	18	(17)
2. BA	71	29	(21)
3. MA	72	28	(53)
4. PhD	61	39	(33)
Funding			
1. Public	74	26	(104)
2. Private (Sec.)	73	27	(11)
3. Private (Rel.)	25	75	(8)
Organization			
1. Department	64	36	(77)
2. Other	81	19	(47)
Staff Size			
1. 1-3	76	24	(29)
2. 4-7	72	28	(39)
3. 8-15	85	15	(26)
4. 16 or more	52	48	(29)
Rank			
1. Inst. or Lect.	56	44	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	61	39	(31)
3. Assoc. Prof.	75	25	(36)
4. Professor	74	26	(47)
Years of Service			
1. 1-3	46	54	(11)
2. 4-7	71	29	(28)
3. 8 or more	73	27	(85)
Age			
1. Under 35	63	37	(35)
2. 35-45	70	30	(43)
3. 46 and over	76	24	(46)
Sex and Race			
1. Male Cauc.	74	26	(105)
2. Female Cauc.	50	50	(12)
3. Male Other	50	50	(6)

Item 41. If faculty members are guaranteed access to their files, obtaining outside letters for promotional decisions has been

	(A) Fairly difficult	(B) Somewhat difficult	(C) Not difficult	
Total (N = 63)	13%	13%	74%	
Number of Students				
1. Less than 1000	67	—	33	(3)
2. 1-5 thousand	15	15	70	(20)
3. 5-10 thousand	14	—	86	(22)
4. Over 10,000	—	28	72	(18)
Highest Degree Given				
1. AA	—	—	100	(6)
2. BA	18	18	64	(11)
3. MA	19	4	77	(27)
4. PhD	5	26	68	(19)
Funding				
1. Public	9	13	78	(54)
2. Private (Sec.)	50	—	50	(6)
3. Private (Rel.)	—	33	67	(3)
Organization				
1. Department	13	15	72	(39)
2. Other	12	9	79	(24)
Staff Size				
1. 1-3	21	—	79	(14)
2. 4-7	14	5	81	(21)
3. 8-15	6	25	69	(16)
4. 16 or more	8	25	67	(12)
Rank				
1. Inst. or Lect.	—	—	—	—
2. Asst. Prof.	—	7	93	(14)
3. Assoc. Prof.	27	5	68	(22)
4. Professor	7	22	70	(27)
Years of Service				
1. 1-3	—	—	100	(2)
2. 4-7	8	17	75	(12)
3. 8 or more	14	12	74	(49)
Age				
1. Under 35	9	9	82	(11)
2. 35-45	19	12	69	(26)
3. 46 and over	8	16	76	(25)
Sex and Race				
1. Male Cauc.	11	11	78	(53)
2. Female Cauc.	33	—	67	(3)
3. Male Other	20	20	60	(5)

Item 42. How (if at all) has unionization affected the roles and operation of departmental committees and general faculty committees?

	(A) Favorably	(B) Unfavorably	(C) No change	(D) Too early to say	
Total (N = 117)	26%	28%	39%	7%	
Number of Students					
1. Less than 1000	50	—	50	—	(4)
2. 1-5 thousand	30	30	30	10	(40)
3. 5-10 thousand	21	27	46	6	(33)
4. Over 10,000	22	30	42	5	(40)
Highest Degree Given					
1. AA	47	18	29	6	(17)
2. BA	24	35	24	18	(17)
3. MA	25	28	43	4	(53)
4. PhD	17	30	47	7	(30)
Funding					
1. Public	24	30	40	7	(98)
2. Private (Sec.)	54	—	46	—	(13)
3. Private (Rel.)	—	60	20	20	(5)
Organization					
1. Department	22	27	43	8	(73)
2. Other	35	32	28	5	(44)
Staff Size					
1. 1-3	42	27	23	8	(26)
2. 4-7	15	22	55	8	(40)
3. 8-15	24	36	32	8	(25)
4. 16 or more	28	32	36	4	(25)
Rank					
1. Inst. or Lect.	22	22	33	22	(9)
2. Asst. Prof.	26	18	52	4	(27)
3. Assoc. Prof.	28	25	42	6	(36)
4. Professor	22	39	32	7	(44)
Years of Service					
1. 1-3	—	33	56	11	(9)
2. 4-7	26	22	44	9	(23)
3. 8 or more	28	29	36	6	(85)
Age					
1. Under 35	23	19	48	10	(31)
2. 35-45	24	32	37	7	(41)
3. 46 and over	27	32	36	5	(44)
Sex and Race					
1. Male Cauc.	21	30	41	7	(99)
2. Female Cauc.	58	8	25	8	(12)
3. Male Other	25	25	50	—	(4)

Item. 43. How (if at all) has selection of department heads and other administrative officials been affected?

UNION	(A) Favorably	(B) Unfavorably	(C) No change	(D) Too early to say	
Total (N = 112)	24%	8%	63%	5%	
Number of Students					
1. Less than 1000	—	—	100	—	(3)
2. 1-5 thousand	44	9	44	3	(36)
3. 5-10 thousand	23	6	71	—	(31)
4. Over 10,000	10	10	69	12	(42)
Highest Degree Given					
1. AA	53	—	40	7	(15)
2. BA	6	19	69	6	(16)
3. MA	30	6	60	4	(50)
4. PhD	10	10	74	6	(31)
Funding					
1. Public	26	7	61	6	(94)
2. Private (Sec.)	8	8	83	—	(12)
3. Private (Rel.)	40	—	60	—	(5)
Organization					
1. Department	18	8	68	6	(72)
2. Other	35	8	53	5	(40)
Staff Size					
1. 1-3	44	4	52	—	(23)
2. 4-7	29	3	60	8	(38)
3. 8-15	16	12	68	4	(25)
4. 16 or more	8	16	68	8	(25)
Rank					
1. Inst. or Lect.	38	—	50	12	(8)
2. Asst. Prof.	28	4	68	—	(25)
3. Assoc. Prof.	24	9	65	3	(34)
4. Professor	18	11	62	9	(44)
Years of Service					
1. 1-3	44	—	56	—	(9)
2. 4-7	23	4	73	—	(22)
3. 8 or more	22	10	60	8	(81)
Age					
1. Under 35	23	7	70	—	(30)
2. 35-45	22	8	65	5	(37)
3. 46 and over	27	9	54	9	(44)
Sex and Race					
1. Male Cauc.	25	8	60	6	(95)
2. Female Cauc.	18	—	82	—	(11)
3. Male Other	—	25	75	—	(4)

Item 44. DEPARTMENTAL HEADS: How (if at all) has unionization affected your role and relations both with your staff and administration?

UNION	(A) Favorably	(B) Unfavorably	(C) No change	(D) Too early to say	
Total (N = 50)	22%	34%	42%	2%	
Number of Students					
1. Less than 1000	—	—	100	—	(1)
2. 1-5 thousand	20	40	40	—	(15)
3. 5-10 thousand	31	31	31	6	(16)
4. Over 10,000	17	33	50	—	(18)
Highest Degree Given					
1. AA	60	20	20	—	(5)
2. BA	—	50	50	—	(8)
3. MA	21	29	46	4	(24)
4. PhD	23	38	38	—	(13)
Funding					
1. Public	26	35	37	2	(43)
2. Private (Sec.)	—	20	80	—	(5)
3. Private (Rel.)	—	50	50	—	(2)
Organization					
1. Department	19	39	39	3	(36)
2. Other	29	21	50	—	(14)
Staff Size					
1. 1-3	25	25	50	—	(8)
2. 4-7	26	32	42	—	(19)
3. 8-15	19	25	50	6	(16)
4. 16 or more	14	71	14	—	(7)
Rank					
1. Inst. or Lect.	100	—	—	—	(1)
2. Asst. Prof.	33	—	50	17	(6)
3. Assoc. Prof.	20	27	53	—	(15)
4. Professor	15	48	37	—	(27)
Years of Service					
1. 1-3	—	—	100	—	(1)
2. 4-7	12	25	50	12	(8)
3. 8 or more	24	37	39	—	(41)
Age					
1. Under 35	12	—	75	12	(8)
2. 35-45	32	47	21	—	(19)
3. 46 and over	17	35	48	—	(23)
Sex and Race					
1. Male Cauc.	23	34	40	2	(47)
2. Female Cauc.	—	100	—	—	(1)
3. Male Other	—	—	100	—	(2)

APPENDIX D

EXCERPTS FROM THE BLOLAND REPORT

What follows is a series of excerpts from Harold G. Bloland and Sue M. Bloland, Learned Societies in Transition (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1974), a report prepared for the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.

(1) "As the union movement expands, it provides an increasingly important alternative to learned societies as a major form of faculty organization. Competing for membership from the same general population, unions represent egalitarian norms that are almost diametrically opposed to the professional and scholarly norms and values of disciplinary associations." (p. 109).

(2) "Since learned societies have traditionally taken for granted the favorable bargaining position of their members as individual scholars and scientists, they have devoted little attention to strengthening this position except insofar as they have sought to strengthen the relative prestige of their disciplines nationally. Thus, in a period of academic retrenchment, when the general bargaining position of college and university faculties is on the decline and conditions of academic employment are deteriorating, unions have begun to seem a more appropriate form of organization for a large segment of the nation's faculty, particularly for those academics whose personal bargaining power is most limited — who hold less preferred positions in the academic system or whose employment is most precarious." (pp. 109-110).

(3) "It is senior faculty members at high-prestige institutions — the group occupying the most preferred position in academia — whose employment status is least threatened by the academic recession and who stand to gain the least from the current proliferation of collective bargaining units on campus. . . . This group has also consistently dominated the prestige and leadership structure in learned societies and continues to reap the most significant rewards from a strong commitment to the national disciplinary networks that these associations represent." (pp. 110-111).

(4) Given this, the Blolands predict that "the size and character of learned-society memberships will undergo major change in the next decade. . . .learned societies [will] once again [become] the more exclusive domain of eminent scholars and scientists from the nation's elite colleges and universities."

(5) But as this prediction comes true, learned societies will suffer reduced memberships, and hence reduced funds for services and staff. (p. 111). There will be reduced need for any "elaborate

governance apparatus" within such societies. (p. 112). The result will be a more exclusive focus on "activities and programs related to the advancement and diffusion of knowledge" (p. 112) — but these activities will draw a much smaller audience. Inflation and "the diminishing availability of university travel funds portends much smaller attendance at national meetings." (p. 112).

(6) "Regional associations are also likely to become more important loci for the exchange of jobs, although there are still indications at present that the job exchange services provided by national learned societies will continue to be in great demand in an unfavorable job market situation. These services may draw considerable numbers of job-seeking Ph.D.'s into short-term membership in national disciplinary organizations as long as they are found to be fruitful sources of employment." (p. 112).

APPENDIX E

EXCERPT FROM THE REPORT OF THE TENURE COMMISSION, UNIVERSITY OF PITTSBURGH, DEALING WITH PART-TIME FACULTY

The following passage has been excerpted from p. 5 of the Report of the Tenure Commission, a study completed in 1974 and available from the Office of the Chancellor, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260. The term 'core faculty' is used in the tenure Report as synonymous with the more common term 'tenure-stream faculty' familiar to most APA members.

"B. Part-Time Members of the Core Faculty

1. The fully-competitive person entering the University at the rank of instructor or assistant professor whose only limitation is in availability of time may, upon request, be considered for appointment to the core faculty on a part-time basis. The same criteria and standards shall apply to part-time and full-time core faculty members: i.e., only those persons shall be appointed to the core faculty on a part-time basis who through open competition would have been appointed to the core faculty on a full-time basis, had it not been for their limitation in availability of time.

2. Such persons should be under contract with the University for no less than half-time.

3. They should be considered full members of the faculty of the University with all rights and responsibilities of such faculty.

4. They should receive salary proportionate to the time contracted for, as well as other fringe benefits, perquisites of space and facilities.

5. Their schedules should reflect their status, and time allotments should be proportioned similarly to those of their full-time colleagues, allowing for scholarly and committee pursuits as well as teaching

6. They shall receive extensions of their non-tenure period for the time not worked, to a maximum of 12 years with one additional terminal year notice. This maximum may not be extended for other leaves as in A 4 and 5.

7. These guidelines shall not be used in any way to circumvent the intent of the non-tenure regulations.

8. The University may grant tenure status at the associate professor or professor rank to part-time persons if they meet all other qualifications.

9. Given proper notice and on the recommendation of the department chairman, dean, and Provost or Vice Chancellor, after a period of full-time service to the University, any person requesting to diminish his University responsibilities may be permitted to retain membership in the University faculty and continue as tenured at a proportionately reduced salary but maintaining appropriate fringe benefits.

10. Part-time core faculty will be subject to the same regulations governing outside employment as full-time core faculty."

APPENDIX F

A SHORT BIBLIOGRAPHY OF PUBLICATIONS ABOUT FACULTY UNIONIZATION

There is a substantial and rapidly growing body of literature (books, monographs, pamphlets, and articles) dealing with academic unions and collective bargaining. Up-to-date information about such publications can be obtained from such agencies as the following: ERIC Clearinghouse on Higher Education, One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036; National Center for the Study of Collective Bargaining in Higher Education, Bernard Baruch College, CUNY, New York, NY 10010; Institute of Continuing Legal Education, University of Michigan Law School, Ann Arbor, MI 48104; Institute of Management and Labor Relations, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903; Industrial Relations Center, Queens University, Kingston, Ontario; Institute of Business and Economic Research, University of California, Berkeley, CA 94720; American Federation of Teachers, 1012 14th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005; American Association of University Professors, One Dupont Circle, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036; National Education Association, 1201 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036; and the Education Commission of the States, 1860 Lincoln Street, Denver, CO 80203.

The following short bibliography contains items which members of the Ad Hoc Committee found to be unusually helpful and informative. Except for The Chronicle of Higher Education, items are confined to books and monographs.

Selected Bibliography

(1) Bloland, Harold G. & Sue H. Learned Societies in Transition. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Hightstown, N. J. (1970).

(2) Carr, Robert K. & Daniel Van Eyck. Collective Bargaining Comes to the Campus. American Council on Education, New York (1973).

(3) Collective Bargaining in Postsecondary Educational Institutions (A Resource Handbook), Education Commission of the States, Denver, Colo. (1974).

(4) Duryea, E. D. & Robert S. Fisk. Faculty Unions and Collective Bargaining. Jossey-Bass Pubs., San Francisco (1973).

(5) Keeton, Morris et al. Shared Authority on Campus. American Association of Higher Education, New York (1971).

(6) Kemerer, Frank R. & J. Victor Baldridge. Unions on Campus. Jossey-Bass Pubs., San Francisco (1975).

(7) Ladd, Everett C. & Seymour Lipset. Professors, Unions, and American Higher Education. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Hightstown, N. J. (1973).

(8) Lozier, Gregory G. A "Classic" Vote for No Representation: Michigan State University. Academic Collection Bargaining Information Service, Washington, D. C. (1974).

(9) Pendleton, Edwin C. & Joyce M. Najita. Unionization of Hawaii Faculty: A Study in Frustration, Industrial Relations Center, U. of Hawaii (1974).

(10) Reports of the University Faculty Senate Ad Hoc Committee to Study the Implications of Collective Bargaining for Faculty Governance, Pennsylvania State U., University Park, Pa. (1973).

(11) Reuben, Elaine & Leonora Hoffman, eds. "Unladylike and Unprofessional": Academic Women and Academic Unions. Modern Language Association, New York (1975).

(12) Seidman, Joel. The Hawaii Law on Collective Bargaining in Public Employment. Industrial Relations Center, U. of Hawaii (1973).

(13) Seidman, Joel & Al Edge, Lane Kelley. Faculty Attitudes and Choice of a Collective Bargaining Agency in Hawaii. Industrial Relations Center, U. of Hawaii (1974).

(14) Shils, Edward B. & C. Taylor Whittier. Teachers, Administrators, and Collective Bargaining. Thomas Y. Crowell Co., New York (1968).

(15) Shulman, Carol H. Collective Bargaining on Campus. American Association on Higher Education, New York (1972).

(16) The Chronicle of Higher Education. (Nearly every issue of this fortnightly paper carries important articles and information about collective bargaining. The November 26, 1973 issue is devoted entirely to academic unionization. Regular reading of the Chronicle is essential to anyone who wants to keep up with the rapid changes and developments in this area.)